

VOLUME 4. Parts 7/9
pp. 159—254.

PARIS, 1948 (18. PATHLOGY).

WINCHES FARM

395, HATFIELD ROAD

ST. ALBANS, HERTS.

25th May, 1950

THE BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

26 MAY 1950

The Official Organ of

THE INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION ON ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Edited by

FRANCIS HEMMING, C.M.G., C.B.E.

Secretary to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

CONTENTS :

<i>The Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948:</i>	Page
Conclusions of Sixth Meeting <i>(concluding portion)</i> - - - - -	159-189
Conclusions of Seventh Meeting - - - - -	190-229
Conclusions of Eighth Meeting - - - - -	230-238
Conclusions of Ninth Meeting <i>(first instalment)</i> - - - - -	239-254

LONDON :

Printed by Order of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature on instructions received from the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, 1948,
and

Sold on behalf of the International Commission by the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature
at the Publications Office of the Trust
41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7.
1950

Price One pound, eight shillings.

(All rights reserved)

the species intended by the original author when citing the name of the erroneously determined species, or (b), if the identity of that species is doubtful, a species in harmony with current nomenclatorial usage, save that where the said Commission was of the opinion that greater confusion than uniformity would result from so doing, it was to direct that the designation or indication, or, as the case might be, the selection as the type species of the genus concerned of the nominal species cited by the original author of the genus was to be accepted.

**Article 30 and
"Opinion" 46
(selection of a type
species for a genus
to which no nominal
species was dis-
tinctly referred by
the original author)**

39. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 30 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion 46* (which lays down what species are eligible for selection as the type species of a genus, the generic name of which is published with a definition or description but with no nominal species distinctly referred to it), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 39 of the list submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

It was pointed out in discussion that of all the *Opinions* rendered by the Commission *Opinion 46*, more than any other, had given rise to confusion and difficulty. There were two reasons for this, first the mutually contradictory decisions recorded in the "summary", second, the discrepancy between the "summary" and certain observations recorded in the section of the *Opinion* headed "Discussion." The first of these difficulties arose from the fact that the "summary" stated that no species was eligible for selection as the type species of a genus established without clearly specified included species unless it could be "recognised from the original generic publication" and that where it was not clear how many or what species were involved, the genus was to be deemed to include "all the species of the world which would come under the generic description as originally published", while in the remaining portion of the same sentence it was stated that "the first species published in connection with the genus (as *Aclastus rufipes* Ashmead, 1902) becomes *ipso facto* the type". No word was said as to what the position would be if the first species so published disagreed with the generic description as originally published. This ambiguity had led to much argument, and much diversity of practice, some workers assuming that the first decision took precedence over the second, others taking the opposite point of view. The second difficulty arose from the fact that the "Discussion" in *Opinion 46* laid down a long series of criteria for determining the method to be adopted in "recognising" the species included in a genus belonging to the present class, criteria which (as experience had shown) were

totally unworkable. These criteria had fortunately not been included in the "summary" of *Opinion 46* and therefore did not form part of the substantive decision embodied in that *Opinion*. Nevertheless, the publication of these criteria in that *Opinion* in a manner which suggested that they formed part of the Commission's decision had been most misleading, and this also had given rise to much misunderstanding and unnecessary confusion.

In further discussion it was agreed that the section of *Opinion 46* requiring that a species to be eligible for selection as a type species must be "recognised from" or "come under" the original generic description was not only in contradiction with the later provision (that "the first species published in connection with the genus becomes *ipso facto* the type") but also offended against the principle (referred to in the discussion on Article 35 at the Meeting noted in the margin) that the *Règles* should be based as far as possible on objective nomenclatorial facts and that their application should be independent of the subjective taxonomic views of individual workers. The first of the provisions in *Opinion 46* had been found unworkable in practice. By far the best course therefore would be to delete the first part of the decision in *Opinion 46*, which, through the subjective character of the rule so laid down, was incapable of securing stability in the nomenclature of the genera concerned. Once this had been done, the remaining portion of the decision in *Opinion 46*, namely that the first species to be cited in connection with a genus originally established without any clearly specified included species was to be accepted as the type species would constitute a rule that was clear, objective and easy to operate.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(For a later decision expanding the scope of this decision, see Paris Session, 12th Meeting, Conclusion 30)

- (1) to recommend that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January 1931, a generic name was published for a genus established (a) with an indication, definition or description (b) with no nominal species distinctly referred to it, the first nominal species to be subsequently so referred to it by the same or another author is to be deemed to have been an originally included species and that species automatically becomes the type species of the genus in question;
- (2) to cancel the decisions embodied in *Opinion 46*, other than the decision proposed in (1) above to be incorporated in the *Règles*.

**Article 30 and
"Opinion" 172
(selection of the
type species of a
genus in a literature-
recording serial)**

**Article 34 and
"Opinion" 147
(application to
generic names of
provisions in the
third paragraph of
Article 35)**

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting, Conclusion 7)

40. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 39 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 172 (which relates to the selection of the type species of a genus in a literature-recording serial), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 40 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where, prior to 1st January, 1931, a name was published for a genus for which no species was designated or indicated as the type species and the first occasion on which one of the originally included species was so selected or specified was in a literature-recording serial, that type selection is to be accepted.

41. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 34 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 147 (which applied to generic names the provisions relating to specific trivial names prescribed in the third paragraph of Article 35), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 41 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reminded the Commission that earlier during the present meeting they had agreed to recommend that the expression "of the same origin and meaning" should be deleted from paragraph (3) of Article 35 and had taken note that the adoption of this recommendation by the Congress would require that a consequential amendment should be made in *Opinion* 147 by which the provisions in regard to specific trivial names contained in that paragraph had been applied to generic names. The Commission had not, however, amended that *Opinion*, in view of the proposals submitted in Commission Papers I.C.(48)10 and 11 in favour of the codification of decisions in existing *Opinions*, as it had been thought that the most convenient method of attaining the desired end would be to await the consideration of the recommendation to be submitted to the Congress for the codification of *Opinion* 147.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that, where it is evident that two generic names either (1) consist of the same Latin word or of the same Latinised word (including proper names other than modern patronymics), or (2) are based upon the same modern patronymic, or (3) are based upon the name of the same continent, country, district, town or other place or upon the name of the same geographical feature such as a mountain, island, sea, river or lake, and the said generic names are distinguished from one another only by one or more of the undermentioned differences in spelling, the two names are to be treated as homonyms of one another.

(*Later Reference :
Paris Session,
9th Meeting,
Conclusion 4*)

- (a) the use of "ae," "oe," and "e";
- (b) the use of "ei," "i," and "y";
- (c) the use of "c" and "k";
- (d) the aspiration or non-aspiration of a consonant;
- (e) the presence or absence of a "c" before a "t";
- (f) the use of a single or double consonant.

**Article 34 and
"Opinion" 25
(clarification of
provisions deter-
mining whether one
generic name is
identical with
another)**

42. In the course of the discussion recorded in the preceding Conclusion, the attention of the Commission was drawn to the interpretation of Article 34 given in *Opinion* 25, in which it had been ruled, in the case of the generic names *Damesiella* Tornquist, 1899, and *Damesella* Walcott, 1905, that a generic name was not to be rejected as a homonym of a previously published generic name if it differed therefrom solely by the presence of the letter "i" before the termination "-ella." The view was expressed that it was neither necessary nor desirable expressly to include in the *Règles* the interpretation of Article 34 given in *Opinion* 25. In a case of this kind the only satisfactory course was for the *Règles* to give a complete list of those cases where differences in spelling were to be regarded as being so small as to render a generic name spelt in one way a homonym of a generic name spelt in the other way and, having done this, clearly to lay it down that any generic name which was distinguished from every other generic name by any other difference in spelling was to be regarded as a distinct name and therefore not to be rejected as a homonym. The first part of this two-fold need had already been met in the *Règles*, for trivial names by Article 35 and for generic names by the decision in *Opinion* 147, by which those provisions had been applied to generic names.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that the provision relating to the differences in spelling which were to be ignored in determining whether a given generic name was a homonym of another generic name specified in Article 34 as amended in accordance with Conclusion 41 above was an exhaustive provision and therefore that no generic name which differed from another generic name in any other way was to be rejected as a homonym of that generic name.

**Article 35 (need for
definition of con-
ditions in which
one trivial name is
to be regarded as
identical with
another)**

43. Arising out of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 42 above, it was pointed out that the provisions in Article 35, prescribing the conditions in which one trivial name is to be regarded as a homonym of another trivial name, required clarification on the same lines as those proposed for generic names in Conclusion 42 above. It was suggested also that, although it should be evident from Article 14

(which requires, *inter alia*, that, where a trivial name is an adjective, it is to agree in gender with the name of the genus to which the species in question is referred) that differences in termination due to differences of gender should be ignored in considering whether any given adjectival trivial name is a homonym of another such trivial name, it would be helpful to some zoologists expressly to lay this down in Article 35.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear :—

- (a) that, in determining whether two trivial names, each consisting of an adjective, are homonyms of one another, no account is to be taken of the gender in which either is expressed and accordingly differences in termination due solely to such differences in gender are to be ignored ;
- (b) that, subject to the insertion in Article 35 of the addition specified in (a) above and of paragraph (e) of the third paragraph of Article 35 in its existing form, the provisions relating to generic names specified in Conclusion 42 above should apply also to trivial names.

**Article 34 and
“Opinions” 125
and 148 (status of
emendations in
relation to generic
homonymy)**

44. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 34 of the *Règles* given in paragraph (2) of *Opinion* 125 in an individual case and in general terms in *Opinion* 148 (which relates to the status of a generic name which is identical with a previously published emendation of an earlier generic name), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 42 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that a generic name is to be rejected as a homonym, where the word of which that name consists has previously been published as an emendation, whether valid or invalid, of another generic name.

**Article 34 and
“Opinion” 148
paragraph (3) :
interpretation in, not
to be incorporated
in the “Règles”
and to be cancelled**

45. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 34 of the *Règles* given in paragraph (3) of *Opinion* 148 (which laid it down that a generic name published as a substitute for a generic name which is an invalid homonym is not to be rejected on the ground that it is of the same origin and meaning as the name which it replaces), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 43 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) that, having regard to the decision recorded in Conclusion 41 above on the subject of the codification of *Opinion* 147, the provisions of paragraph (3) of *Opinion* 148 were no longer appropriate and should not be incorporated in the *Règles*.
- (2) to cancel paragraph (3) of *Opinion* 148.

**Articles 34 and 35
and "Opinion" 102
(status of a generic
or trivial name when
a homonym of the
name of a unit of
sub-ordinal or
higher category)**

46. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Article 34 of the *Règles* given in *Opinion* 102 (which laid it down that the availability of a generic name is not affected by the prior publication of the same or a similar word as the name for a unit of a higher category), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 44 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

It was pointed out that the wording in the "summary" was unsatisfactory, (a) because, in view of the combined provisions of Articles 4 and 8, the problem discussed in that *Opinion* could not arise in connection with a family name and was therefore confined to cases where the name given to a new genus had already been given to a unit of sub-ordinal or higher rank, and (b) because homonymy could only arise if the name published for the new genus was the same name as that previously used for a unit of sub-ordinal or higher category. The reference in the "summary" to a situation in which the names used were similar but not identical was therefore entirely misconceived. It was necessary that these defects should be eliminated before proposals were submitted for the codification of the decision embodied in this *Opinion*.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that the Law of Homonymy does not apply as between generic or trivial names on the one hand and the names of units belonging to categories above the family level on the other, and therefore that, where such a name consists of a word which has already been used as the name of a unit of Sub-Ordinal or higher category, that name is not to be rejected as an invalid homonym (Example : The Ordinal name *Siphonophora* Eschscholtz, 1829, does not invalidate the generic name *Siphonophora* Koch, 1855) ;
- (2) that a *Recommandation* should be inserted at an appropriate point in the *Règles* deprecating the selection as generic or trivial names of words

previously published as the names of units of Sub-Ordinal or higher category.

**Articles 25, 34 and
35 and "Opinion"
145 (subsequent
status of a name
first published in a
work rejected for
nomenclatorial
purposes)**

(Later reference:
Paris Session, 12th
Meeting Conclusion 35)

47. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the interpretation of Articles 34 and 35 of the *Règles* given in Opinion 145 (in relation to the status of generic and specific names, when those names have been previously published in works rejected for nomenclatorial purposes), together with the proposals in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 45 of the list contained in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where a work is rejected for nomenclatorial purposes either under Article 25 or under a decision taken by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature under their plenary powers, no name, whether a generic name or a trivial name, which first appeared in such a work, is to be treated as having any status either in respect of the Law of Priority (Article 25) or in respect of the Law of Homonymy (Articles 34–36) as from the date of its appearance in a work so rejected, and that in consequence no later name is to be rejected as a synonym on the ground that some other name had been applied to the genus or species concerned in a work so rejected and no later name is to be rejected as a homonym on the ground that it had previously been used in such a work.

**Article 25 (meaning
of expression
"divulgué dans
une publication") :
postponement of
consideration of
interpretations of,
in "Opinions" 15
and 51**

(Later reference:
Paris Session, 7th
Meeting, Conclusion
15)

**Repeal for inter-
pretative purposes
of certain
"Opinions"
rendered by the
Commission**

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting, Conclusion
9(1)(b))

48. THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to defer consideration of the interpretations of the expression "divulgué dans une publication" as used in Article 25 of the *Règles*, given in Opinions 15 and 51, until they came to consider the general proposals for the clarification of the foregoing expression submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14 (Point (26)).

49. On concluding the survey, recorded in Conclusions 11 to 47 above, of the interpretations of Articles of the *Règles* given in the *Opinions* listed in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11, THE COMMISSION recalled the decision in regard to the status to be accorded to interpretative *Opinions* after the interpretations given therein had been incorporated in the *Règles*, in whole or in part, which they had taken when earlier during the present meeting they had considered Commission Paper I.C.(48)10 and agreed :—

to repeal for interpretative purposes, that is to say for all except historical purposes, with effect from the date on which the amendments to the *Règles* made by the present Congress become operative :—

(a) the whole of the undermentioned *Opinions*, namely :—

Opinions 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 10, 35, 46, 62, 64, 65, 87, 141, 145, 147, 148, 164, 168, 172, 183, 191 ;

(b) the portions of the undermentioned *Opinions* which contain interpretations of Articles of the *Règles*, namely :—

Opinions 14, 16, 18, 25, 26, 27, 29, 36, 41, 43, 47, 49, 52, 59, 60, 61, 63, 88, 102, 125.

**Resolutions on
questions relating
to nomenclature
embodied in
“Declarations”
rendered by the
Commission :
proposed codifica-
tion of**

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 4th
Meeting, Conclusion
4(2)(f))

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 3rd
Meeting, Conclusion
7(2))

50. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission containing detailed proposals for the incorporation in the *Règles* of the resolutions on various aspects of zoological nomenclature embodied in the *Declarations* rendered by the Commission at various dates (Commission Paper I.C.(48)13).

THE COMMISSION :—

- (1) recalled that, since Commission Paper I.C.(48)13 had been prepared, they had agreed in principle at the meeting noted in the margin to recommend the incorporation in the *Règles* of provisions embodying the resolutions recorded in certain of the *Declarations* rendered by the Commission at various times ;
- (2) recalled that at the meeting noted in the margin they had already agreed to recommend that the Plenary Powers Resolution of March, 1913 (which formed the subject of *Declaration* 5), as amended at that meeting, should be incorporated in the *Règles* ;
- (3) agreed that the questions dealt with in *Declarations* 9 and 10, being of the nature of statements of policy, were not of a kind which could appropriately be incorporated in the *Règles* ;
- (4) agreed to examine *Declarations* 1–4, 6–8, 11 and 12, and the recommendations in regard thereto submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)13, with a view to reaching conclusions in regard to the incorporation in the *Règles* of the provisions included in those *Declarations*.

**"Declarations"
1 and 12 (Code of
Ethics)**

51. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the Resolutions relating to the Code of Ethics embodied in *Declarations* 1 and 12, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 6 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be inserted in the *Règles* an Article laying it down that, when a worker notices that a generic or subgeneric name or a name of a species, subspecies or infra-subspecific form published as a new name by an author who is alive at the time of the foregoing discovery is invalid by reason of being a homonym and requires to be replaced, the author making such a discovery should notify the author by whom the name in question was published and, before himself publishing a substitute name, should, so far as practicable, give the original author an opportunity of so doing, it being made clear that the observance of the foregoing provision is a matter to be left to the proper feelings of individual workers, it not being part of the duties of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature to investigate or pass judgment upon alleged contraventions of this provision.

**"Declaration" 4
(avoidance of in-
temperate language
in the discussion of
zoological
nomenclature)**

52. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the Resolution deprecating the use of intemperate language in the discussion of zoological nomenclature embodied in *Declaration* 4, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 7 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be inserted in the *Règles* an Article laying it down that the use of intemperate language is to be avoided in the discussion of zoological nomenclature.

**"Declaration" 2
(avoidance of issue
of separates in
advance of publica-
tion of the paper
concerned)**

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting, Conclusion
19)

53. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the Resolution deprecating the distribution of separates of a paper prior to the publication of that paper embodied in *Declaration* 2, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 8 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

In submitting the foregoing matter to the Commission, the ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that it had already been decided to recommend to the Congress that words should be inserted in the *Règles* embodying the interpretation of Article 25 given in *Opinion* 59, in which the Commission had laid it down that a new name which appeared in the separate of a paper distributed

prior to the publication of that paper in the book or serial for publication in which it had been printed ranked for purposes of priority not from the date of the distribution of the separates but from the later date on which the paper in question was actually published in the serial in question. The Resolution embodied in *Declaration 2* had been adopted by the Commission simultaneously with *Opinion 59*, of which it was intended to be a supplement; it urged authors to avoid the practice of distributing separates in advance of the publication of the book or serial containing the paper reproduced in such separates. *Declaration 2* could therefore appropriately be embodied in the *Règles* as a *Recommandation* to the portion of Article 25 in which the provisions of *Opinion 59* were to be embodied.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

that there should be added to the portion of Article 25 in which the decision given in *Opinion 59* was to be embodied a *Recommandation* urging editors not to make available, and authors not to distribute, copies of papers prior to those papers being actually published in the book or serial for inclusion in which they had been printed.

**“Declaration” 6
(need for clearly
indicating as new
every name when
first published)**

(Previous reference:
*Paris Session, 5th
Meeting, Conclusion
I(8)(a) and (b)*)

54. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the portion of the Resolution embodied in *Declaration 6* which urged every author who publishes a new name clearly to indicate that he is so doing, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 9 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reminded the Commission that, since the foregoing proposal had been submitted, they had agreed, at the meeting noted in the margin, at which they had considered the plan for regulating the nomenclature of subspecies and infra-subspecific forms, to recommend the insertion in the *Règles* of a *Recommandation*, urging every author, when publishing a new subspecific name, to add the expression “ssp.n.” or some equivalent expression immediately after the subspecific trivial name and, when publishing a name for a new infra-subspecific form, the expression “form. n.” or some equivalent expression. For these two categories of name, the Commission had therefore already agreed to recommend the insertion in the *Règles* of a *Recommandation* which would give effect to the Resolution embodied in *Declaration 6*. In order fully to give effect to the Resolution embodied in that *Declaration*, it was necessary now to deal in a similar way with names at the species level

and above covered by the *Règles*, that was to say, with names of Families to names of species (both inclusive).

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that there should be added at some appropriate point in the *Règles* a *Recommandation* urging every author, when publishing a new Family or Sub-Family name clearly, to indicate that that name is a new name by inserting immediately after that name a comma followed by the expression "fam.n." or "sub-fam.n.", as the case may be, or some equivalent expression ;
- (2) that there should be added to the *Règles* a *Recommandation* urging every author, when publishing a new generic or subgeneric name or a new specific name, clearly to indicate that that name is a new name by inserting immediately after that name a comma followed by the expression "gen.n.", "subgen.n.", "sp.n.", as the case may be, or some equivalent expression.

**"Declaration" 6
(need for avoiding
the publication of
a name as new on
more than one
occasion)**

55. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the portion of the Resolution embodied in *Declaration 6*, which urged authors not to publish names as new names on more than one occasion, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 9 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be added at some appropriate point in the *Règles* a *Recommandation* or *Recommendations* urging every author, when publishing a new name belonging to a category recognised in the *Règles*, i.e. a new name for any category from Family to infrasubspecific form (both inclusive), (a) not to publish that name as a new name in more than one book or paper and (b) not to publish in more than one serial a paper containing a new name, without indicating on the second, or any subsequent, occasion that the paper in question had already been published and giving a bibliographical reference to the serial in which that paper had been first published.

**"Declarations" 3
and 8 (need for
giving a clear
indication of date of
publication)**

56. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the Resolutions embodied in *Declarations 3* and *8* regarding the need for giving in every zoological book or other publication a clear indication of its date of publication, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 10 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be added at some appropriate point in the *Règles* a *Recommandation* urging every editor or other person concerned with the publication of a book or serial concerned with zoology to take all necessary steps to ensure :—

- (a) that its exact date of publication (year, month, day) be clearly stated in every zoological work ;
- (b) that, in the case of serials and separate works published in parts, each part shall bear its exact date of publication and that on the completion of the volume concerned there shall be added a statement giving the date on which each part was published and specifying its exact contents (both pages and plates).

**"Declaration" 7
(need for citation of
bibliographical
references)**

57. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the Resolution on the need for the citation of bibliographical references embodied in *Declaration* 7, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 11 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be added at some appropriate point in the *Règles* a provision urging every author who cites a generic, subgeneric, specific, subspecific, or infra-subspecific name to insert at least once in the paper concerned the name of the author, and the date of publication, of each name cited or preferably to give a full bibliographical reference to the original place of publication of every such name.

**"Declaration" 11
(need for indicating
the systematic
position of new
taxonomic units)**

58. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the Resolution on the need for indicating in original descriptions the systematic position in the Animal Kingdom of the taxonomic unit described, embodied in *Declaration* 11, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in paragraph 12 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)13.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be added at some appropriate point in the *Règles* a *Recommandation* urging every author, when naming a new taxonomic unit from Family to infra-subspecific form, clearly to indicate the systematic position of that unit in the Animal Kingdom, and, in the case of categories from genus to infra-subspecific form (both inclusive), to indicate the Class and Order to which the unit in question is

referable and, if the Order concerned is commonly divided into Families, the name of the Family to which the unit in question is referable.

Repeal except for historical purposes of "Declarations" so far rendered by the Commission

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 9(2)(e)*)

59. On concluding the survey, recorded in Conclusions 51 to 58 above, of the Resolutions embodied in the *Declarations*, regarding which proposals were submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)13, THE COMMISSION recalled the decision in regard to the status to be accorded to *Declarations* after the Resolutions set forth therein had been incorporated in the *Règles*, which they had taken when earlier during the present meeting they had considered Commission Paper I.C.(48)10.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to repeal except for historical purposes the *Declarations* so far rendered by the Commission, namely *Declarations* 1-12, with effect from the date on which the amendments to the *Règles* made by the present Congress become operative.

Miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the "Règles": first instalment to be considered item by item

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 4*)

60. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary to the Commission containing a list of twenty miscellaneous proposals for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles* (Commission Paper I.C.(48)12).

THE COMMISSION :—

- (1) recalled that, since Commission Paper I.C.(48)12 had been prepared, they had agreed in principle at the meeting noted in the margin to recommend the adoption of such amendments to the *Règles* as might be necessary for the clarification of existing provisions, for providing for matters not already dealt with, and for removing blemishes due to careless or inexpert drafting ;
- (2) agreed to examine Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, point by point, for the purpose of reaching conclusions regarding the recommendations to be submitted in regard to the questions raised therein.

Article 8 (need for brevity in generic names), insertion of "Recommandation" regarding

61. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (Z.N.(S.)297) for the insertion of a provision in Article 8 of the *Règles* designed to encourage authors to select short words for new generic names, together with the proposal in regard thereto submitted in Point (1) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12. This proposal had been originally submitted by Professor J. C. Faure (University of Pretoria, Union of South Africa) on behalf of himself and others. More recently a similar proposal of somewhat

wider scope had been received from Professor Pierre Bonnet (University of Toulouse, France).

In the discussion on this proposal general agreement was expressed regarding the desirability of the insertion in Article 8 of a *Recommandation* (as proposed by Professor Faure) urging authors to select short words when proposing names for new genera and subgenera. It was felt, however, that there were objections to indicating (as was proposed) a specified number of letters as the maximum to be used for any generic or subgeneric name. The general view was that the desired object could best be promoted by a *Recommandation* urging that such names should be short. It was agreed also to add to the *Recommandation* that such words should be euphonious. Admittedly, there were words which were euphonious in some languages but not in others, but in judging whether for the present purpose a given name was or was not euphonious, it must be borne in mind that, as the language of zoological nomenclature was the Latin language, it was from this standpoint that the question must be viewed.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be added either to Article 8 or to Article 25, whichever was found to be the most convenient, a *Recommandation*, urging every author, when naming a new genus or subgenus or renaming a genus or subgenus the name of which is invalid by reason of being a homonym, to select a name which was short and, from the standpoint of the Latin language, euphonious.

Article 13 (deletion of provisions permitting the use of a capital initial letter for a specific trivial name in certain cases)

62. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (2) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, that the provision in Article 13 under which an author was given the option to write certain classes of specific (and subspecific) trivial names with a capital initial letter should be deleted from the *Règles*. This proposal had been submitted independently also by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) in the fourth of the propositions which he had laid before the Commission.

This proposal was warmly welcomed, the view of those present being that the use of a capital initial letter for a specific trivial name was objectionable, as being liable to cause confusion between specific trivial names so written and generic names. This provision had been inserted in Article 13 in Berlin in 1901 because at that time there were many zoologists who habitually used capital initial letters for certain classes of specific trivial name and who were

unwilling to abandon that practice. In the 50 years which had since elapsed the number of such zoologists had greatly diminished and was now extremely small. The time had therefore come when this obsolete provision should be repealed.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that Article 13 should be redrafted so as to require that every specific trivial name should be written with a small initial letter.

Article 14 (need for brevity in specific and subspecific trivial names), insertion of a "Recommandation" regarding

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting, Conclusion
61)

63. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (3) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12 that, consequential upon the adoption of the proposal submitted in Point (1) of that Paper that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 8 urging the desirability of selecting short words as the names of new genera and subgenera, a corresponding *Recommandation* should be added to Article 14, in regard to the selection of new specific and subspecific trivial names.

The view was expressed that in this matter the provisions in the *Règles* in regard to specific and subspecific trivial names should correspond with those for generic and subgeneric names. It would be necessary therefore to amend the proposal submitted in the present case in the same way as it had just been agreed to amend the corresponding proposal in regard to generic and subgeneric names.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should either be added to Article 14 a *Recommandation*, urging every author, when naming a new species or subspecies or renaming a species or subspecies the name of which was invalid by reason of being a homonym, to select a name which is short and, from the standpoint of the Latin language, euphonious, or, if it were found more convenient to attach to Article 25 the *Recommandation* regarding the foregoing problem in relation to the names of genera and subgenera, which, as agreed in Conclusion 61 above, it was proposed should be added either to Article 8 or to Article 25, to include in that *Recommandation* a reference to the trivial names of species, subspecies and infra-subspecific forms.

Examples cited in the "Règles" to be drawn only from works by binominal authors

64. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (4) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12; in which attention was drawn to the fact that, as Goeze was not a consistently binomial author, it was not suitable that that author's usage of a previously

published specific name should be cited as an example in Article 24. It was accordingly proposed that this example should be deleted from that Article and that another example based upon the action of a strictly binominal author should be inserted in its place.

It was pointed out in the discussion that Article 24 was not the only place in the *Règles* where a usage by Goeze was cited as an example, and the view was expressed that it was desirable that the proposal submitted should be extended so as to cover all examples at present included in the *Règles* which were drawn from the usage of non-binominal authors.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that "examples" cited in the *Règles* to illustrate particular provisions should be drawn only from the works of strictly binominal authors and that, wherever at present an "example" was drawn from a work by an author who was not strictly binominal, that example should be replaced by one which conformed to the requirement specified above.

Article 22 (abbreviation of authors' names): substitution of a revised "Recommendation"

65. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (5) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12 that the *Recommandation* which at present appeared in Article 22 of the *Règles* should be deleted and that there should be inserted in its place a new *Recommandation* urging authors, when citing scientific names, not to abbreviate the names of the authors of such names, except in the case of very well-known deceased authors. As regards the first of these proposals, it was pointed out that in the course of the last 50 years the existing *Recommandation* contained in Article 22 had become obsolete and unworkable, as the book which that *Recommandation* advised authors to consult had long been out of print and was virtually unobtainable. A proposal in the same sense as the above had been received from Professor Pierre Bonnet (France).

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the existing *Recommandation* should be deleted from Article 22 and that there should be inserted in its place a *Recommandation* urging authors, when citing previously published names or previously published papers, to refrain from abbreviating the name of the author of the name or paper concerned, except, if it was so desired, the names of deceased authors whose names, even if abbreviated, would be easily recognised, by reason of the importance of their published work.

**Articles 25, 34 and
35 (status of
apparent new
names or new
combinations due
to errors in
literature-recording
serials defined)**

66. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Dr. Curtis W. Sabrosky (Washington) (file Z.N.(S.)334), in regard to the status of apparent new names (generic or trivial) and new combinations, where these are due to errors in abstracting or literature-recording serials, together with a proposal in regard thereto submitted in Point (6) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be added to Article 25 to make it clear that, when reference to an original publication shows that an apparent new name (whether generic or trivial) or an apparent new combination appearing in a literature-recording serial is due to an error in that serial, the apparent new name or new combination shall have no status in nomenclature and is not to be held to pre-occupy for the purposes of Article 34 or Article 35 the same name or the same combination when later published deliberately for the same or another genus or species, as the case may be.

**Article 25, Proviso
(b) (meaning of the
expression
“principes de la
nomenclature
binominale”)**

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 4th
Meeting, Conclusion 3)

67. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (7) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, in regard to the meaning of the expression “principes de la nomenclature binominale”, which it had been agreed, at the meeting noted in the margin, should be substituted for the expression “principes de la nomenclature binaire”, which at present appeared in Proviso (b) to Article 25 of the *Règles*.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in Article 25 to make it clear that, in order to qualify, for the purposes of Proviso (b) to Article 25, as an author who had applied “les principes de la nomenclature binominale”, an author must have consistently applied those principles in the book or paper in question and not merely in a particular section or passage thereof.

**Article 30
(clarification of
applicability to
generic names
published after
31st December,
1930)**

68. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (8) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, that the position should be clarified as regards the applicability of Article 30 of the *Règles* to generic names published after 31st December 1930, that is to say, to generic names published subsequent to the entry into force of the provisions of Proviso (c) to Article 25 adopted by the Budapest Congress in 1927.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the wording of Article 30 had been defective ever since the beginning of 1931, for, although, as it stood, the wording implied that the Article applied to every generic name, irrespective of its date of publication, Rules (b) and later Rules had as from 1st, January 1931, been restricted, in their application, to names published on or before 31st December, 1930, owing to the coming into force on 1st January, 1931 of the amendment to Article 25 adopted by the Congress at its Budapest meeting in 1927. It was desirable that, as part of the general clean-up of the *Règles*, words should now be inserted in Article 30 to make the position clear. As regards Rules (a) to (d) in Article 30 the Commission had agreed (at the meeting noted in the margin) to recommend that words should be inserted in Article 30 to make it clear that in their present form these Rules applied to names published on or after 1st January, 1931 as well as to names published before that date. Earlier in the present meeting, the Commission, when considering the action to be taken for the incorporation in the *Règles* of interpretations given by the Commission in *Opinions* rendered before the opening of the present Congress, had had under consideration the interpretation of Rule (a) given in *Opinion* 7 and the interpretations of Rule (d) given in *Opinions* 18 and 16, and had agreed to recommend that words should be inserted in Article 30 to give effect to those interpretations, so far as regards generic names published on or before 31st December, 1930, but that it should be made clear at the same time that these interpretations of Rules (a) and (d) in Article 30, which, in effect, represented relaxations of those Rules, should not apply to generic names published on or after 1st January, 1931, the date as from which newly published generic names became subject to the more rigorous provisions of Proviso (c) to Article 25.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that words should be inserted in Article 30 to make it clear :—
 - (a) that in their present form (i.e. in their pre-Paris Congress form) Rules (a), (b), (c) (as relaxed by *Opinion* 47) and (d) apply to every generic name, irrespective of its date of publication ;
 - (b) that the wording which, in accordance with the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin, it was now proposed should be employed to enlarge the scope (i) of Rule (a) to give effect to the interpretation thereof

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 4th
Meeting, Conclusion 8)

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting, Conclusions
27, 29, 30)

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting, Conclusions
27, 29, 30)

given in *Opinion 7*, and (ii) of Rule (d) to give effect to the interpretations of that Rule given in *Opinions 16* and *18* should be such as to make it clear that those interpretations applied only to generic names published prior to 1st January, 1931;

(c) that Rule (e) and subsequent Rules apply only to names published prior to 1st January 1931;

(2) that the words to be inserted in Article 25 to give effect to the decision taken at the meeting noted in the margin should be so selected as to make it clear that no generic or subgeneric name published after 31st December, 1930 is to be treated as having been published with a designated or indicated type species, unless such a species is so designated or indicated in accordance with one or other of the Rules in Article 30 lettered (a) to (d), as those Rules existed at the opening of the present Congress, that is to say without the extensions to Rules (a) and (d) specified in (1)(b) above.

Article 30 (drafting amendments required to remove ambiguities)

69. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S).352) submitted in Point (9) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, that there should be inserted in Article 30 such drafting amendments as might be necessary to make it clear that the provisions of that Article were concerned with nomenclature and not with taxonomy. It was pointed out that what was required was that the wording should be modified so as to make it clear that the purpose of this Article was to provide rules by which, for any given nominal genus (i.e. the concept denoted by a given generic name) one of the originally included nominal species (i.e. the concept denoted by one of the specific names cited) is to be designated, indicated or selected as the type species of the nominal genus in question. One of the modifications required was the substitution in this Article of the expressions "nominal genus" and "nominal species" for the expressions "genus" and "species" at present used. The introduction of these expressions would eliminate from this Article such expressions as "publication of a genus", which involved a serious confusion of thought.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) reminded the Commission that, when, at the meeting noted in the margin, they had drawn up recommendations for clarifying Article 31, they had found it necessary to introduce the expression "nominal species"

(*Previous reference: Paris Session, 4th Meeting, Conclusion 11*)

for in no other way was it possible in that Article to distinguish, in the case of a composite species, between the nomenclatorial concept of a "nominal species" and the concept of the various taxonomic species of which the single "nominal species" was composed. The object of the proposal to substitute the expression "nominal species" for the expression "species" in Article 31 was to make it clear that it was the first and not the second of these concepts with which that Article was concerned. It was for similar reasons that it was proposed to substitute in Article 30 the expression "nominal genus" for the expression "genus", wherever that expression was at present employed. Finally, it was necessary to introduce words into this Article to make it clear, as regards any given "nominal genus" which were the "nominal species" which were to be regarded as having been included in the genus by the original author when he published the generic name and therefore which were the "nominal species" from among which a later author was entitled to select the type species of the "nominal genus" concerned in those cases where the type species was not designated or indicated at the time when the generic name was first published.

In the discussion which ensued, there was general agreement that, like Article 31, Article 30 was in need of clarification in order to eliminate ambiguities and to secure that the wording employed was directed solely to the problem of nomenclature involved in determining the type species of any "genus" represented by a given generic name (i.e. any "nominal genus"). The question of the nominal species to be regarded as having been originally included in any given "nominal genus" and thus eligible for selection as the type species of that nominal genus was one of some difficulty. If it had been practicable, the most satisfactory course would have been to restrict the field of selection for the type species of a given nominal genus to those nominal species which had been accepted by the original author as taxonomically valid species and had been included by him in the genus. In a large number of cases however the currently adopted type selection of a nominal genus was one in which some author had selected as the type species a nominal species which had been included by the original author of the generic name not as a taxonomically valid species but as a synonym of one of the nominal species accepted by him as a taxonomically valid species and included by him as such in the nominal genus concerned. It was undesirable to do anything which would invalidate such type selections, for this would involve considerable disturbance in existing nomenclatorial practice. The words to be inserted in Article 30 should make it clear therefore that the nominal species to be

accepted as having been included in a nominal genus at the time when the name of that genus was first published comprised (1) all the nominal species cited by the author of the generic name and accepted by that author as valid taxonomic species and (2) any nominal species cited by that author as a synonym of a nominal species falling in class (1) above. The selection as the type species of a nominal genus of a nominal species not cited by the original author when first publishing the generic name in question could not be accepted, for such a selection ran counter to the provisions of Rule (e) (a) of Article 30. It should be made clear however that, where an author selects a non-originally-included nominal species to be the type species of a given nominal genus and at the same time synonymises that nominal species with a nominal species which was in fact an originally included species, he is to be accepted as having selected that originally included nominal species to be the type species of the nominal genus concerned.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that throughout Article 30 the expression "nominal genus" should be substituted for the expression "genus" and the expression "nominal species" for the expression "species", these expressions being defined as follows :—

<i>Expression</i>	<i>Definition</i>
"Nominal genus"	The concept denoted by a given generic name.
"Nominal species"	The concept denoted by a given specific name.

(2) that the wording of the Rules in Article 30 should be modified to such extent as might be necessary to secure the uniform use (a) of the expression "establishment of a nominal genus" in place of such expressions as the "publication of a genus", (b), of the expression "type species of a nominal genus" in place of such expressions as "type species of a generic name" and (c) of the words "designate" and "designation" and "indicate" and "indication" for the determination of the type species of a nominal genus, in the first instance under Rule (a) and in the second instance under Rules (b), (c) and (d), the words "select" and "selection" to be used only in connection with Rule (g);

(3) that words should be inserted at appropriate points in Article 30 to make it clear :—

(a) that the nominal species to be regarded as having been included in a given nominal genus at the time when the name of that

genus was first published are (i) the nominal species cited by the original author as valid taxonomic species belonging to that nominal genus and (ii) any nominal species cited on that occasion as synonyms of nominal species falling in (i) above and that for such a nominal genus the foregoing nominal species were alone eligible for selection as the type species;

- (b) that, where a subsequent author selects as the type species of a nominal genus a nominal species which is not an originally included species, as defined in (a) above or accepts the selection of such a nominal species by a previous author and at the same time synonymises that nominal species with a nominal species which is one of the originally included species, he is to be accepted as having selected that originally included nominal species to be the type species of the nominal genus in question.

Substitution in the "Règles" of the expressions "nominal genus" and "nominal species" for the expressions "genus" and "species" in certain cases

70. Arising out of the discussion regarding the phraseology to be used in Article 30 recorded in the preceding Conclusion,

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that throughout the *Règles* the expressions "nominal genus" and "nominal species" should be substituted for the expressions "genus" and "species" respectively, wherever the provision in question referred not to a genus or to a species in the taxonomic sense but to the concept represented by a given generic name or specific name, as the case might be.

Article 30 (need to eliminate the expression "Rule" from non-mandatory provisions)

71. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (10) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, that the expression "Rule" should be reserved in Article 30 for the mandatory provisions (i.e. the provisions at present lettered (a) to (g)) and that the remaining provisions in this Article, which (as there expressly stated) were *Recommandations* should no longer be lettered consecutively with the (mandatory) Rules. The present arrangement of this Article, which was no doubt due to inexpert drafting, was not only illogical but (as the literature showed) was liable to give the erroneous impression that provisions (h) and later provisions, though described as *Recommandations*, nevertheless possessed some mandatory character.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that the expression " Rule " in Article 30 should be restricted to the first seven provisions (i.e. the provisions lettered (a) to (g)) in that Article which alone possess mandatory force ;
- (2) that the non-mandatory precepts at present lettered (h) to (t) should be given a serial notation different from that adopted for the mandatory provisions referred to in (1) above and should be grouped in a *Recommandation* which would urge every author, when selecting a nominal species to be the type species of a nominal genus in accordance with the procedure specified in Rule (g), to guide himself in making that selection by the precepts in question, those precepts being applied successively in the order in which they were there specified.

Article 30, Rule (g)
(status of a
statement as to the
type species of a
nominal genus
made otherwise
than as a
deliberate selection)

72. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (11) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, that words should be inserted in Rule (g) in Article 30 to make it clear that a definite statement by a subsequent author that a given originally included nominal species is the type species of a given nominal genus is to be accepted as a type selection, irrespective of whether or not the author making that statement considered himself as at that moment selecting a type species for the nominal genus in question.

In the discussion on this proposal the view was expressed that the issue raised was one on which it was important that a definite ruling should be given ; many thousands of currently accepted type selections rested upon action taken before the introduction of the present *Règles* (i.e. before their promulgation in 1905) by authors who accepted what was then known as the " Law of Elimination " and who, after studying the earlier history of a given generic name, had stated that, as the result of the action of such and such an author or authors, a given nominal species was the type species of the nominal genus concerned. Very great confusion would arise if it were now to be ruled that published statements of this kind were not to be accepted as effective type selections under Rule (g) in Article 30.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, for the purposes of Rule (g) in Article 30, an author is to be treated as having selected a given originally included nominal species to be the type

species of a given nominal genus not only when he cites such a species, other than a species excluded under Rule (e) in Article 30 and expressly states that he is so selecting that species but also when he does no more than state that a specified such species is the type species of the nominal genus concerned, irrespective, in the latter case, of whether he states or implies, either correctly or otherwise, that that nominal species had been selected by some previous author to be the type species of that nominal genus or that the nominal species in question had become the type species of that genus through the operation of some rule (for example, the so-called "Law of Elimination") not recognised in the *Règles* as a mandatory provision, provided in such a case that the author concerned makes it clear that he himself accepts, for whatever reason, the species in question as the type species of the genus concerned.

Article 31 (proposed redrafting of first sentence of, to promote greater clarity)

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 4th
Meeting, Conclusion
11)

73. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (12) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, that the first sentence of Article 31 of the *Règles* should be redrafted, so as to include a direct statement of the provisions intended in place of the present obscure wording by reference to the provisions in Article 30.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) explained that, since the foregoing proposal had been submitted, the question involved had been settled by the Commission, when considering Commission Paper I.C.(48)6. No action was therefore now called for on the present proposal. Article 31 would however require further amendment if the Commission were to adopt the proposals in regard to the terminology of type specimens, submitted in Point (14) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12. It would, he suggested, be more convenient to defer consideration of this matter until the Commission came to consider Point (14).

THE COMMISSION took note of the above statement.

Article 35 (status of emendations in relation to homonymy in the names of species and lower taxonomic categories)

74. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted in Point (13) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, that there should be inserted in Article 35 (relating to specific homonymy) a provision parallel to that laid down in connection with generic homonymy in *Opinion* 148. Proposals for the incorporation in Article 34 of the interpretation of that Article in relation to the status of generic names published as emendations of

earlier names had already been submitted to the Commission in Commission Paper I.C.(48)11 ; the proposal put forward in the present Paper was that, whatever decision in this matter might be taken as regards Article 34 in relation to generic names, that decision should be extended to cover also Article 35 in relation to the names of species and subspecies.

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting, Conclusion
44)

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that the Commission had now adopted recommendations based on the proposal in regard to generic names submitted in paragraph 42 of Commission Paper I.C.(48)11. He suggested therefore that the Commission should now agree to adopt a recommendation in regard to specific and subspecific trivial names parallel to that already adopted in the case of generic names. The proposed provision should apply also to the names of infra-subspecific forms.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear :—

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting, Conclusion
20)

- (a) that a specific trivial name published as an invalid emendation of an earlier specific trivial name (i.e. a specific trivial name published as an emendation in conditions which do not satisfy the requirements of Article 19) is to be rejected as a synonym of the earlier name, where that name is an available name, the type specimen of the nominal species having as its name the invalid emendation being automatically the same specimen as the type specimen of the nominal species bearing the name which has been invalidly emended ;
- (b) that, where a specific trivial name is rejected as an invalid homonym and the next oldest name for the species concerned is an invalid emendation of that name and that invalid emendation is sufficiently different in spelling from the original name not to be a homonym thereof under the provisions contained in Article 35, the specific trivial name originally published as an invalid emendation becomes an available name for the species in question and such a name has priority as from the date on

which it was first published as an invalid emendation and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published ;

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting, Conclusion
44)

- (c) that a specific trivial name is to be rejected as a homonym (either primary or secondary) where the word of which that name consists has previously been published as an emendation, whether valid or invalid, of the specific trivial name of another species either originally published, or subsequently placed, in the same genus, save where the original name did not comply with the requirements of Article 25 ;
- (d) that the foregoing provisions apply also as between the trivial name of a species and the trivial name of a subspecies of a species originally described or subsequently placed in the same genus and as between the trivial names of subspecies of one or more species so described or so placed ;
- (e) that the provisions specified in (a) to (c) above apply as between the trivial names of infraspecific forms of one or more species originally described, or subsequently placed, in the same genus.

Terminology of type specimens : proposed insertion in the "Règles" of Articles and "Recommendations" regarding

75. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) that a new Article with accompanying *Recommendations* should be inserted in the *Règles* regulating the terminology of type specimens, submitted in Point (14) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12. This proposal included suggestions for the recognition of certain specified categories of type specimens, for the designation and marking of such specimens and the measures to be taken for their safe custody.

In the discussion on this proposal, the following points were made :—

- (a) It was very desirable that the inadequate provision in regard to type specimens at present included in the *Appendice* to the *Règles* should be replaced by comprehensive regulations on the lines suggested in the paper submitted to the Commission. As submitted, those proposals related only to animals which were sufficiently large for individual specimens to be mounted separately, and it would be necessary to provide for the case where, by reason of the small

size of the animals concerned, two or more specimens were mounted in a single preparation. Similarly, it would be necessary to provide not only (as in the proposal submitted) for species having separate sexual forms but also for species which did not have such forms.

- (b) A Declaratory Article should be inserted in the *Règles* stating that type specimens of the categories now to be defined were the property of science. Such an Article would be of value in reminding the owners of type specimens of the responsibilities incurred by such ownership.
- (c) The categories of type specimens which it was desirable should be recognised and defined in the *Règles* were those which possessed a direct nomenclatorial significance, namely holotypes, syntypes and lectotypes. It was not necessary to recognise paratypes, for, although paratypes were of great practical value in many ways, they possessed no nomenclatorial significance, since in any given case they came into existence only when a holotype was designated or a lectotype selected.
- (d) It was to be hoped that after the introduction of the scheme outlined above zoologists would abandon the use of the vague expression "type".
- (e) The question whether provision should be made for the recognition in the *Règles* of the category "neotype" should be deferred until the Commission had had an opportunity to consider the proposals submitted in Point (16) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12.
- (f) The provisions to be inserted in the *Règles* should cover type specimens of species, subspecies and infra-subspecific forms.

(Later reference:
Paris Session, 7th
Meeting, Conclusion 3)

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that the inadequate provisions regarding type specimens inserted in the *Appendice* in the second sentence of Section "A" and between Sections "A" and "B", by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Monaco in 1913 should be deleted;
- (2) that there should be added either a new Article or as additions to Article 31 :—

(a) recognising and defining as follows the under-mentioned categories of type specimens :—

<i>Category</i>	<i>Definition of category.</i>
Holotype ..	The single specimen designated or indicated as "the type" by the original author at the time of the publication of the original description.
Syntype ..	One of a number of specimens of equal nomenclatorial rank which formed all or part of the material before the original author, in those cases where that author did not designate or indicate a holotype.
Lectotype ..	A single specimen selected, subsequent to the publication of the original description, from a series of syntypes to be "the type", such selection, in order to be effective, to be a selection made known through being announced in a publication;

(b) making it clear for the purposes of (a) above that it is immaterial whether the specimen designated as the holotype or selected as the lectotype is a separately mounted specimen or is mounted with other specimens in a single preparation provided, in the latter case, that for this purpose a single specimen is distinguished in some appropriate manner from the other specimens included in the preparation.

- (3) that the expressions recognised in (2) above be substituted, as appropriate, for the expression "type", wherever that expression is used in the *Règles* in relation to a type specimen ;
- (4) that a Declaratory Article should be inserted in the *Règles* declaring that holotypes, syntypes and lectotypes are the property of science and should be so regarded by zoologists ;

(Previous reference:
*Paris Session, 6th
Meeting, Conclusion
73)*

- (5) that the provisions specified in (2) to (4) should apply to the type specimens of all nominal forms belonging to the categories species, subspecies and infra-subspecific form ;
- (6) that a *Recommandation* should be added to the Declaratory Article specified in (4) above, strongly urging every author who publishes a description of, and gives a new name to, a species or who selects a lectotype from a series of syntypes of a species which had previously been described and named, to deposit the holotype or, as the case may be, the lectotype, of that species in a museum or other institution where the specimen will be safely preserved and will be accessible for purposes of research ;
- (7) that the following *Recommandations* be inserted at appropriate points in the *Règles* :—
 - (a) a *Recommandation* strongly urging that every author who publishes a description of, and gives a new name to, a species should clearly designate a single specimen (of either but not both sexes, in the case of animals having separate sexes, and of one, but not more than one, developmental stage or form, in the case of species having distinct developmental stages or more than one form) to be the holotype of that species, and should indicate in the original description (1) the full locality and other data on the label attached to that specimen, (2) in the case of animals having separate sexes, the sex of the specimen so selected, (3) in the case of a species having distinct developmental stages or more than one form, the stage or form to which the specimen so selected is referable, (4) in the case of parasitic species, the name of the host species (5) the name of the collector by whom the specimen was obtained, (6) the collection in which the holotype is deposited and the collection number assigned to the specimen, (7) in the case of living terrestrial species, the elevation in metres above sea level, and in the case of living marine species, the depth in metres below sea level, at which the holotype was taken and (8) in the case of fossil species, the estimated

geological age of the species, measured, if possible, by the number of metres by which the spot where the holotype was found lies above, or below, a well-established plane;

- (b) a *Recommandation* strongly urging that, where, in default of a holotype having been designated or indicated by the original author of a name, the same or another author later selects from a series of syntypes a specimen to be the lectotype, that author should observe the principles specified in the opening portion of the *Recommandation* set out in (a) above and, in publishing the selection so made, should give the particulars numbered (1) to (8) in the said *Recommandation*;
- (c) a *Recommandation* strongly urging every author who :—
 - (i) publishes a description of, and gives a new name to, a species should affix to the specimen designated as the holotype a conspicuous label indicating that the said specimen has been so designated ;
 - (ii) in default of a holotype having been designated or indicated by the original author, selects a lectotype from a series of syntypes, should affix to the specimen so selected to be the lectotype, a conspicuous label indicating that the specimen in question has been so selected ;
- (8) that the *Recommandations* specified in (7) above should apply to the holotypes and lectotypes of subspecies and infra-subspecific forms in like manner as to those of species.

**Consideration of
points (15) to (20)
in Commission
Paper I.C.(48)12
postponed until the
Seventh Meeting of
the Commission
during its Paris
Session**

76. On the proposal of the Acting President, THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to defer until their next meeting (i.e. their Seventh Meeting) the consideration of the remaining Points (Points (15) to (20)) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12.

**Seventh and Eighth
Meetings of the
Commission during
its Paris Session :
date and time
appointed**

77. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) proposed that the Commission should meet again that evening at 2030 hours for the purpose of completing their consideration of Commission Paper I.C.(48)12 and of considering Commission Paper I.C.(48)14. On the following day, Friday, 23rd July, 1948, a meeting of the Commission would be held at 0900 hours, concurrently with the first meeting of the Section on Nomenclature.

THE COMMISSION took note of, and approved, the above arrangements.

(The Commission thereupon adjourned at 1910 hours.)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

*Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology,
Paris, 21st–27th July, 1948*

CONCLUSIONS of the Seventh Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the
Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Thursday, 22nd July, 1948, at 2030 hours

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
 Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico)
 Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
 Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
 Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
 Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
 Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
 Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
 Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
 Dr. Ellsworth C. Dougherty (U.S.A.)
 Professor E. Raymond Hall (U.S.A.)
 Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*
 Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer*

**Terminology of
type specimens :
proposed additional
“Recommendation”**

(*Previous reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting, Conclusion
75*)

1. Before continuing their consideration of Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, THE COMMISSION reverted to the question of the terminology of type specimens, on which they had reached certain conclusions shortly before the close of their previous meeting. The point raised was concerned with the use of the expression "co-type." On this the view was expressed that it was desirable to discourage the use of this expression, the meaning of which had now become ambiguous, in view of the fact that, while many authors used this expression in a sense identical with that of "syntype," there were numerous authors who used this expression as though it had the same meaning as the expression "paratype." A *Recommendation* deprecating the use of this expression should be added to the Article enumerating the names of the categories of type specimens to be recognised for nomenclatorial purposes which it had been agreed to recommend should be inserted in the *Règles*.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be added to the new Article enumerating the categories of type specimens to be recognised for nomenclatorial purposes which, as agreed by the Commission at the Sixth Meeting of their Paris Session (Conclusion 75(2)), was to be proposed for addition to the *Règles*, a *Recommandation* urging authors, in the interest of avoiding misunderstanding, to refrain from using the expression "co-type."

**Need for provision
for naming of
nominotypical
subspecies**

2. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) relating to the trivial name of the nominotypical subspecies of a species having two or more subspecies submitted in Point (15) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12. It was pointed out that, although the *Règles* contained a provision (Article 9) regarding the name to be applied to the typical subgenus of a genus in which two or more subgenera are recognised, there was no provision relating to the parallel problem presented by the typical subspecies of a species having two or more subspecies (the nominotypical subspecies). This was an anomaly which should be corrected.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a new Article making it obligatory to apply to the typical subspecies of a species having two or more subspecies (to be known as the nominotypical subspecies) the same trivial name as that of the species itself;
- (2) that an appropriate reference to the new Article referred to in (1) above should be inserted in the provision to be inserted in the *Règles* exempting the trivial name of the nominotypical subspecies from liability to rejection as a homonym of the trivial name of the species concerned.

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting, Conclusion
1(18))

**Neotypes : proposed
recognition as a
category of type
specimens :**
**Secretary to prepare
comprehensive
report on**

3. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal for the recognition in the *Règles* of the category "neotype" submitted by Dr. Don L. Frizzell and Dr. Harry E. Wheeler, the text of which had already been published in the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* (1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 106–108) (file Z.N.(S.)24), together with a note on certain of the problems raised by this proposal by the Secretary to the Commission (see 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 108–111) and the suggestions as to the best approach to be made to this subject submitted in Point (16) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12.

THE COMMISSION :—

- (1) took note that there was considerable difference of opinion among zoologists regarding the desirability of inserting provisions in the *Règles* recognising the category "neotype," some workers, particularly in palaeontology, being strongly in favour of this course, while others were opposed to it on the ground that the recognition of this category would be likely to give rise to abuses (commercial and other) and to lead to greater confusion than uniformity;

- (2) agreed :—
 - (a) that the proposal to recognise the category "neotype" raised complex problems which required much closer and more detailed study than had yet been given to them;
 - (b) that, if the Congress were to be recommended to recognise the category "neotype," it would be essential that the proposals so submitted should be comprehensive in character and should contain adequate safeguards against the abuse of the new provisions by mercenary or irresponsible persons;
 - (c) that, in view both of the intrinsic difficulties involved in the proposed recognition of the category "neotype" and of the wide differences of opinion on the subject which at present existed among zoologists, it was essential that further discussions should be held with interested groups of specialists before the Commission submitted any recommendation to the Congress for the amendment of the *Règles* to deal with this subject;

- (3) agreed to recommend :—

that the Secretary to the Commission should be invited to make a thorough study, in conjunction with interested specialists, of the problems involved in the proposal that the category "neotype" should be recognised in the *Règles* and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration by the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission of

a considered statement of their views on this subject and, if they decided in favour of recommending that the foregoing category of type specimen should be recognised in the *Règles*, of a comprehensive scheme to that end.

**Misuse of the
“Règles” in a
manner calculated
to give political,
religious or
personal offence :
measures to
prevent**

4. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by a large number of Brazilian zoologists that means should be found to provide against the risk of the *Règles* being used for the purpose of giving personal offence, a misuse which it was alleged had recently occurred in their own country in a particular instance (file Z.N.(S.)348), together with proposals for dealing with the above problem submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (17) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12. The Secretary, while agreeing with the view expressed by the applicants that it was desirable that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* to deal with the misuse of the *Règles* in this way, suggested that this provision should be so drafted as to cover cases of the use of zoological nomenclature in a manner calculated to give not only personal offence but also offence either on political or religious grounds. Legal advice might be needed in the application of the proposed provision.

THE COMMISSION

- (1) agreed to place on record their strong disapproval of the use of the *Règles* in any manner calculated to give offence on political, religious or personal grounds;
- (2) agreed to recommend that there should be inserted in the *Règles* provisions to the following effect:—
 - (a) The use for a generic or subgeneric name or for the trivial name of a species, subspecies or infra-subspecific form of a word (whether simple or compound) which can reasonably be regarded, in any language, as calculated to give offence on political, religious or personal grounds is prohibited.
 - (b) No name published in contravention of the provisions of (a) above is to possess any status in zoological nomenclature.
 - (c) It shall be open to any person or group of persons who is, or are, of the opinion that a given name has been published in contravention of the provisions of the present

Article to refer the question to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, and it shall be the duty of the said Commission promptly to consider every case so submitted to it, and, if satisfied that the submission is well-grounded, to order the name concerned to be suppressed for all purposes, in accordance with the provisions of (b) above.

- (d) The procedure to be followed by the Commission in considering applications submitted under (c) above shall be governed by such regulations as the Commission may from time to time prescribe.

**The "Regles" :
proposed drafting
amendments to
secure greater
clarity and to
eliminate un-
necessary and
undefined repetitive
phrases**

5. THE COMMISSION had under consideration proposals (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted by the Secretary in Points (18), (19) and (20) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)12, for the improvement of the *Regles* by the insertion of certain minor drafting amendments designed to secure greater clarity or to eliminate the unnecessary and therefore misleading use of two or more undefined expressions to denote the same concept.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that, when the jurists were requested to embody in the *Regles* such amendments and other changes as might be agreed upon by the present Congress, they should at the same time be requested to make such minor drafting changes as might be necessary :—

- (a) to secure that in the mandatory portions of the *Regles* nouns should, for the sake of clarity, be used, wherever possible, in the singular number in preference to the plural number, thereby eliminating anomalies such as those presented by the wording at present employed in the opening phrase of Article 20 and in the corresponding phrase of Article 30 ;
- (b) to remove verbal inconsistencies in drafting such as the indiscriminate use in Article 30 of the phrases "type species," "generic type" and "type" to denote the same concept and the use in the same Article of the expression "publication" (in Rules (a) and (b)) and the expression "proposed" (Rule (c)) to denote exactly the same idea ;

(c) to delete unnecessary and undefined repetitive expressions such as the expressions " *seu* diagnosis ; *seu* definition ; *seu* condensed description " used in Proviso (c)(1) to Article 25 as synonyms of the expression " summary of characters " and the expressions " *seu* genotype ; *seu* autogenotype ; *seu* orthotype " used in Proviso (c)(3) to the same Article as synonyms of the expression " type species. "

**Miscellaneous
proposals for the
amendment or
clarification of the
"Règles" : second
instalment**

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting, Conclusion
60)

6. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary (Commission Paper I.C.(48)14) containing a second instalment of miscellaneous proposals received from various sources for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*. For convenience of reference these proposals, which were twelve in number, had been numbered consecutively with the proposals brought forward in the paper containing the first instalment (Commission Paper I.C.(48)12): The present proposals were therefore numbered (21) to (32).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to examine Commission Paper I.C.(48)14, point by point, for the purpose of reaching conclusions regarding the recommendations to be submitted on the questions raised therein.

**Article 8 (case of a
generic name
treated as a noun
in the nominative
singular but which
was in fact a
latinised version of
a noun in another
language in a case
other than the
nominative or a
number other than
the singular)**

7. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Commissioner H. Boschma designed to secure the incorporation in Article 8 of a provision to cover the case of a generic name which, though published by its original author as a noun substantive in the nominative singular, was in fact a latinised version of a word in some other language, where the word so used was in some case other than the nominative or some number other than the singular (file Z.N.(S.)223), together with a note on the same subject, submitted in Point (21) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

It was explained that the kind of case here contemplated was that presented by the generic name *Potamon* Savigny, 1816, which, though published by its original author as a noun substantive in the nominative singular, was in fact a latinised version of the Greek word Ποταμῶν, i.e., of the genitive plural of the Greek noun Ποταμός, having thus the meaning " of rivers. " It would be unreasonable to reject a generic name formed in this way on the ground that it had not been published in the nominative singular. If such rejection were to be avoided, it would be necessary to

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 6th
Meeting, Conclusion
12)

insert a saving clause in Article 8, in view of the decision already taken that the substance of the interpretation of Article 8 given in *Opinion 183* should be incorporated in that Article.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be added to Article 8 of the *Règles*, when amended in the manner agreed upon at the Sixth Meeting of the Commission during their present Session (Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 12), a Proviso making it clear that a generic name which was treated by its original author as a latinised noun in the nominative singular is not to be rejected as invalid on the sole ground that it consists of a latinised version of a word or combination of words belonging to any language other than Latin, the word or words as so used being, prior to latinisation, in some case other than the nominative or some number other than the singular or in both case and number other than the nominative singular.

Article 14 (addition of a "Recommandation" urging authors to avoid giving as new trivial names words already so used in allied groups)

8. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 14 urging authors not to select for the trivial names of species and subspecies words already published as the names of species or subspecies in allied groups and indicating the criteria recommended to be followed by authors in this matter (file Z.N.(S.)352), together with a note on the foregoing proposal submitted by the Secretary in Point (22) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

There was general agreement that the selection as new trivial names of such words as *vulgaris*, *domesticus*, *niger*, *silvestris*, etc., was liable to give rise to confusion when those names had already been published as the trivial names of species and subspecies in allied groups, even when the words could properly be used in this way in the sense that such employment did not involve a breach of the Law of Homonymy. It was felt, however, that no advantage would be served by attempting to specify in the proposed *Recommandation* the exact limits within which the publication of trivial names already published for species and subspecies in allied groups should be avoided.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be added to Article 14 a *Recommandation* urging authors when selecting trivial names for new species or subspecies or when selecting such

names as substitutes for names which are invalid under the Law of Homonymy, to refrain from selecting words already published as the trivial names of species or subspecies occurring in any part of the world, where the species concerned are referred to genera allied to that to which the species or subspecies to be named is assigned.

**Article 15 (proposed
redrafting of, to
eliminate the
existing option to
link by hyphens the
components of a
trivial name
consisting of a
compound word)**

9. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) that Article 15 should be re-drafted in such a way as to eliminate the option contained in this Article in its present form, under which it is legitimate to use as the trivial name of a species or subspecies a combination of words linked together by a hyphen (file Z.N.(S.)352), together with a note on the foregoing proposal submitted by the Secretary in Point (23) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

The object of Professor Bonnet's proposal was not to prohibit the use of combinations of words as the trivial names of species and subspecies, but to secure that, when names were formed in this way, the two words forming the combination should be written as one and should not be linked together merely by a hyphen. It was generally felt that the object sought was desirable but that, in the form in which it was actually submitted, the proposal was too far-reaching : there were certain trivial names which were deliberately designed to show that the species so named possessed a distinguishing mark in the form of a letter (e.g. the trivial name *c-album* published by Linnaeus as *Papilio c-album* in 1758, for a butterfly which was distinguished by having on the under-side of the hindwing a white mark in the form of the letter "c"). It would clearly be undesirable to require that this name should be printed as "*calbum*" instead of "*c-album*." It was suggested also that the present opportunity should be taken to make it clear that, where a binominal author introduces a new trivial name consisting of a compound word and that trivial name, on being first published, is incorrectly printed as though it consisted of two words, it is not on that account to be rejected but is to be corrected by later authors in the same way as names incorrectly formed under Articles 14-16, 18 or 20. For example the trivial name *nova hispaniae* published by Gmelin in 1789 for a species of *Coluber* should not be rejected but should be corrected to *novaehispaniae*.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that words should be inserted in Article 15 to make it clear that, where a trivial name is formed from a combination of words, those words are to be

treated as constituting a single word and are not to be merely united together by a hyphen, save that, where a trivial name has been formed for the purpose of indicating that the taxonomic unit concerned is distinguished from other such units by a mark having the form of a letter of the Latin alphabet (for example, a name such as *c-album*), the letter of the alphabet forming the first portion of the name is to be separated from the remaining portion of the name by the interposition of a hyphen;

- (2) that either in Article 15 or elsewhere in the *Règles* as may be found appropriate there should be inserted words to make it clear that, where an author who in the book or paper concerned has duly applied the principles of binominal nomenclature, as required by proviso (b) to Article 25, publishes a trivial name consisting of a compound word, which, on being so first published, is printed as though it consisted of two separate words (for example the trivial name *novae hispaniae* Gmelin, 1789), that name is not on that account to be rejected but is to be treated as though it had been duly published as a single compound word (e.g. *novaehispaniae*);
- (3) that, where a trivial name is published in a manner which contravenes either (1) or (2) above, that name is automatically to be corrected by subsequent authors, and shall rank for purposes of priority as from the original author and date of publication in accordance with the provision relating to the correction of names published in contravention of Articles 14–16, 18 and 20 agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin.

(Previous reference:
Paris Session, 4th
Meeting, Conclusion 5)

Article 15 (orthography of compound trivial names, where the first part of the compound consists of a number)

10. In the course of the discussion on the item recorded in the preceding conclusion, the attention of the Commission was drawn to the anomalous position which existed in the case of the trivial names of species where the name was a compound name and the first part was a number. There were many such names, for the presence of a specified number of markings of a given kind often constituted a good diagnostic character. Such names were often formed in combination with adjectives such as *guttatus*, *signatus*, etc. In some cases the number forming the first part of the name was indicated by its Latin name, while in other cases it was often indicated by the Arabic numerical sign appropriate for the number in question. Thus, the same name

might sometimes appear as "*quattuor-guttatus*" (or "*quattuorguttatus*") or as "*4-guttatus*."

The view was expressed that, as zoological nomenclature consisted of a system in which Latin words were used in particular ways and not of a system of numerals, it was wrong in principle to employ as a trivial name a hybrid designation such as "*4-guttatus*," which consisted partly of a numeral and partly of a word. Quite apart from this important theoretical objection, there were also important practical objections to the use of names formed in the foregoing manner. Names so formed, were, for example, a source of difficulty to those zoologists who possessed no knowledge of the Latin language: they led to errors and inconsistencies in the alphabetisation of trivial names and, in extreme cases, were responsible, in conversation, for such verbal monstrosities as "*four-guttatus*," "*eleven-signatus*," etc. Moreover, the use of names written in this way led to difficulties in the application both of the Law of Priority and of the Law of Homonymy. For example, there were cases of trivial names originally published as say "*4-maculatus*" of which the numeral had sometimes been (correctly) transliterated as a cardinal number (i.e. as *quattuor*), while at other times it had been treated as an ordinal number, the form "*quadri-*" being adopted.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend:—

that there should be inserted in the *Règles*, either in Article 15 or elsewhere, a provision or provisions making it clear:—

- (a) that, where the trivial name selected for a species, subspecies or infra-subspecific form is a compound word, constructed so as to indicate that the taxonomic unit concerned may be recognised by a specified number of characteristics or by the presence of a specified number of examples of a given characteristic and the first portion of the name is intended to denote the number of characteristics in question or the number of examples of a given characteristic in question, as the case may be, that portion of the name is to be indicated by the Latin word representing the cardinal number concerned (as, for example, "*quattuorguttatus*") and is not to be indicated by a numeral (as, for example, "*4-guttatus*");
- (b) that, where a trivial name of the kind specified in (a) above has been, or is, published with the first part of the name indicated by a numeral instead of by a word indicating the cardinal number concerned:—

- (i) the name in question is automatically to be corrected by subsequent authors, the two words of which such a name, when so corrected, is composed being printed as a single word and not united merely by a hyphen ; and
- (ii) the name so corrected is to rank for the purposes of the Law of Priority and the Law of Homonymy as from the date on which it was originally published in the incorrect form and is to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published, in like manner as trivial names when corrected to comply with the provisions of Articles 14–16, 18 or 20.

*(Previous reference :
Paris Session, 4th
Meeting, Conclusion 5)*

Article 14
**(clarification of
provisions relating
to the formation of
trivial names based
upon the names of
persons)**

11. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) suggested that at this point the Commission should consider a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) for the clarification of the provisions in Article 14 relating to the formation of trivial names in those cases where it was desired to give honour to some person by using his or her name as the basis of the trivial name. As all systematic workers knew from experience, the existing portion of Article 14 dealing with this matter was both badly worded and also incomplete. The proposals submitted by Professor Bonnet could be summarised as follows :—

- (a) Trivial names in the genitive case which are based
 - (1) upon the names of personages of antiquity or
 - (2) upon the prénoms (as contrasted with the surnames) of modern personages, whether living or dead, should follow the rules of Latin declension in those cases where the names in question were of Latin origin ;
- (b) Trivial names based on the surnames of modern personages, whether living or dead, including surnames derived from words of Latin origin, should, subject to the exceptions noted in (c), (d) and (e) below, consist, as at present, of the exact surname of the person concerned to which should be added the appropriate termination in the genitive case, the terminations in question being :—
 - (i) the termination “-i” where the trivial name is based on the name of a man ;

- (ii) the termination “*-ae*” where the trivial name is based on the name of a woman;
- (iii) the termination “*-orum*” where the trivial name is based on the name of two or more men, each having the same surname;
- (iv) the termination “*-arum*” where the trivial name is based on the names of two or more women, each having the same surname;
- (c) Where a trivial name is based upon the name of a modern personage and that personage is a woman whose surname ends in the letter “*a*”, the trivial name based thereon should be formed by substituting the termination “*-ae*” for the termination “*-a*”;
- (d) Where a trivial name is based upon the surname of any of the following modern personages, that name should be formed as follows:—

<i>Modern surname</i>	<i>Trivial name based on surname in column (1)</i>
-----------------------	--------------------------------------------------------

(1)	(2)
Linnaeus or Linné	<i>linnaei</i> (not <i>linnaeusi</i> or <i>linnei</i>)
Fabricius	<i>fabricii</i> (not <i>fabriciusi</i>)
Poda	<i>podae</i> (not <i>podai</i>)

- (e) Where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage and that surname ends with the letter “*q*”, the letter “*u*” is to be inserted immediately after the letter “*q*” and before the appropriate genitival termination;
- (f) Where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage and that surname is preceded by a nobiliar particle (e.g. the particle “*de*,” “*di*,” “*von*,” etc.), that particle is to be omitted when forming the trivial name in question (the correct form for a trivial name based, for example, upon the modern surname “*de Lessert*” thus being *lesserti* not *delesserti*), save in those cases:—
 - (i) where the particle is actually attached to the modern surname in question (as in the case of the surname “*Dujardin*”) or where, by long custom, it forms an integral portion of the surname (as in the case of the surname “*De Geer*”), in either of which cases the particle is to be retained when forming a trivial name based upon the surname in question (the correct form for trivial names based upon the

modern surnames cited in the foregoing examples being in the first case *dujardini* (not *jardini*) and in the second case *degeeri* (not *geeri*);

- (ii) where the particle consists either of the letters "Mac" or "Mc" or the letter "O" followed, in the latter case, by an apostrophe, in either of which cases the particle and, in the second case, the apostrophe also, is to be retained when forming a trivial name based upon the surname in question, the first letter of the portion of the surname following the particle being written with a small letter (trivial names based upon the modern surnames MacCook and O'Connor thus taking the forms *maccooki* and *o'connori* respectively);
- (g) Where a trivial name is based upon a modern surname commencing with the particle "Mc," the letter "a" should be inserted between the letter "m" and the letter "c";
- (h) Where a trivial name is based upon a modern French surname and that surname is preceded by the definite article ("le," "la" or "les") (as in the case of the surname "Le Sueur"), the definite article is to be incorporated in the trivial name (the correct form of trivial name in the example cited above thus being *lesueuri*, not *sueuri*);
- (i) Where a trivial name is based upon a modern French surname and that name is preceded first by the particle "de" and second by the definite article "la", the definite article is to be incorporated in the trivial name but not the particle "de" (the correct form for a trivial name based on the surname "de la Roche" thus being *larochei* not *delarochei*);
- (j) Where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage and that surname consists of two surnames linked together by a hyphen, one only of the two names in question should be selected when forming the trivial name in question, preference being given to the better known of the two surnames in question (for example, in forming a trivial name based on the surname of the French naturalist Guérin-Méneville, preference should normally be given to the name Guérin, by which this naturalist was commonly known, rather than to Méneville, the trivial name formed being thus *guérini*, though the trivial name *ménévillei* would also be permissible)

(k) Where a trivial name is based upon the name of a Christian Saint, the qualifying adjective (Saint, Sainte, Sancti, Sancto, San, etc.) should be excluded from the trivial name, a trivial name based upon the name of Saint Remy thus taking the form *remyi*.

In the discussion which ensued the following points were made :—

- (i) *Proposal (a)* : The first part of this proposal dealt with a matter which was already covered by Article 14, though only inferentially, and it was certainly desirable that an express provision should be inserted to deal with it. The second part of this proposal dealt with a matter on which the *Règles* were at present silent. It was certainly a defect that no distinction should be made in Article 14 between “prénoms” on the one hand and surnames on the other in the case of names of modern personages where those names were selected to form the basis of a trivial name. The proposal submitted was desirable and should be accepted. It would be necessary for the new Article to deal separately with names of Latin and Greek origin and to provide that the latter should follow the rules of Greek declension.
- (ii) *Proposal (b)* : This proposal was in the main a restatement of the existing provision in Article 14. It was however an improvement on the existing text, both because it made it clear that the provisions in question applied only to the surnames of modern personages and also because it gave clearer and more precise directions regarding the terminations to be attached to the end of a modern surname, when it was decided to use that surname as the basis of a trivial name formed in the genitive case. It was pointed out, however, that there was one situation which had not been covered, namely where it was desired to form a trivial name based upon the surname of two or more persons and those persons were of different sex. Clearly, in such a case the normal rule of Latin grammar should be applied and the termination to be selected should be in the masculine gender. This should be made clear when Article 14 is redrafted.
- (iii) *Proposal (c)* : The question raised in this proposal required consideration, for although the addition of the “-ae” to a feminine name which ended in

the letter "a" was both inharmonious and anomalous, it was felt that further study of the implications of the proposal was desirable before a recommendation on this subject was submitted to the Congress.

- (iv) *Proposal (d)*: This proposal was warmly welcomed, it being felt that it would be absurd to insist that a trivial name based upon the name of Linnaeus should take the form *linnaeusi*, though, as the name Linnaeus was a modern surname, this was what was required by the existing provisions of Article 14. It was obvious that special provision would need to be made for exceptional cases of this kind. It was likely that experience would show the need for adding to the list of exceptions in this matter.
- (v) *Proposal (e)*: This proposal was also warmly welcomed. It was a barbarism, in any system of nomenclature which purported to use the Latin language to permit the existence of words in which the letter "q" was followed by any letter other than the letter "u". The fact that this matter was not dealt with in the existing text of the *Règles* was no doubt due to inadvertence on the part of the original draftsmen.
- (vi) *Proposal (f)*: A long discussion took place on the first part of this proposal. It was agreed that in principle the proposal was well founded but the evidence brought forward showed that in some languages (for example, in Italian) it would be impossible in practice to apply a provision of the kind suggested. The second part of this proposal met with general approval.
- (vii) *Proposal (g)*: It was considered that, although logical, this proposal was misconceived, for it was explained that it was often no matter of accident whether a surname of the class in question started with the letters "Mac" or "Mc". It was agreed however that it should be made clear at an appropriate point in the *Règles* that, where the foregoing was the only difference in spelling between two surnames, the publication of a trivial name based upon one such name (say, the trivial name *maccooki* based upon the surname MacCook) would render invalid as a homonym a later published trivial name based upon the other surname (e.g. a name *mccooki* based

upon the name McCook would in such circumstances be invalid).

- (viii) *Proposal (h)* : General agreement was expressed with this proposal. It should be extended to cover modern surnames of French origin as well as modern French surnames.
- (ix) *Proposal (i)* : It was felt that further study of the probable effects of a rule of the kind proposed was desirable before a proposal thereon was submitted to the Congress.
- (x) *Proposal (j)* : This proposal was logical but it was considered that in this case also further study was required before a proposal was submitted to the Congress. It would be necessary to co-ordinate any provision on the lines suggested with the existing provisions relating to the formation of trivial names based upon the names of places. It would probably be found that, while there were many trivial names based upon the names of places (e.g. St. Helena), the first portion of which, when Latinised, started with the adjective *sanctus* or *sancta* (as in *Sancta Helena*), the number of trivial names actually selected for the purpose of honouring Saints was very small.

THE COMMISSION :—

- (1) agreed to recommend that Article 14 should be redrafted to such extent as might be necessary to provide :—
 - (a) that a trivial name formed in the genitive case which is based either (i) upon the name of a personage of Classical Antiquity (including gods, goddesses and mythological characters) or (ii) upon a “*prénom*” (i.e. any name borne by a person in addition to his or her surname) of a modern personage, whether living or dead, in any case where that first name is of Latin or Greek origin, should follow the rules of Latin declension in the case of a name of Latin origin and the rules of Greek declension in the case of a name of Greek origin ;
 - (b) that a trivial name based upon the surname of a modern personage, whether living or dead, including a trivial name based upon a surname of Latin or Greek origin, should, subject to the provisions of (c) and (d)

below, consist of the exact surname of the person concerned, to which should be added the appropriate termination in the genitive case, that is to say :—

- (i) in the case of a trivial name based on the surname of a man, the termination “ -i ”;
- (ii) in the case of a trivial name based on the surname of a woman, the termination “ -ae ”;
- (iii) in the case of a trivial name based on the surname of two or more persons having the same surname, where one or more of the persons is a man, the termination “ -orum ”;
- (iv) in the case of a trivial name based on the surname of two or more persons having the same surname, where all the persons concerned are women, the termination “ -arum ”;
- (c) that, where a trivial name is based upon the surname of any of the undermentioned modern personages, that name should be formed as follows :—

*Surname of modern Trivial name based
personage on surname specified
 in Column (1)*

(1)	(2)
Linnaeus (Linné)	<i>linnaei</i> (not <i>linnaeusi</i> or <i>linhei</i>)
Fabricius	<i>fabricii</i> (not <i>fabriciusi</i>)
Poda	<i>podae</i> (not <i>podai</i>)

- (d) that, where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage and that surname ends with the letter “ q ”, the letter “ u ” is to be inserted between the letter “ q ” and the appropriate genitival termination ;
- (e) that, where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage and the first portion of that surname consists either
 - (i) of the particle “ Mac ” or “ Mc ” or
 - (ii) of a particle composed of the letter “ O ” followed by an apostrophe, the particle, in the first case, and the particle and the

apostrophe in the second case, is to be retained in the trivial name, the first letter of the remaining portion of the surname being written with a small letter, trivial names based, for example, on the modern surnames "MacCook" and "O'Connor" thus taking the form of *maccooki* and *o'connori* respectively;

- (f) that, where a trivial name is based upon a modern French surname or upon a modern surname of French origin and that surname is preceded by the definite article ("le", "la", or "les") (as in the surname, "Le Sueur"), the definite article is to be incorporated in the trivial name (the correct form of a trivial name based on the surname cited in the foregoing example thus being *lesueuri* not *sueuri*);
- (2) agreed to postpone for further consideration the undermentioned proposals :—
 - (a) that, where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage and that personage is a woman whose surname ends in the letter "a", the trivial name so based should be formed by substituting the termination "-ae" for the existing termination "-a";
 - (b) that, where a trivial name is based upon a modern French surname or upon a modern surname of French origin and that surname is preceded first by the particle "de" and second by the definite article "la", the definite article is to be incorporated in the trivial name but not the particle "de", the correct form of a trivial name based, for example, on the French surname "De la Roche" thus being *larochei* not *delarochei*;
 - (c) that, where a trivial name is based upon the name of a Christian Saint, the qualifying adjective *sanctus* should be omitted from the trivial name, the correct form of a trivial name based, for example, on the name of St. Remy thus being *remyi*;
- (3) agreed to reject the undermentioned proposals :—
 - (a) that, where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage and that

surname is preceded by a nobiliar particle (e.g. the particle "de", "di", "von", etc.), that particle is to be omitted when forming the trivial name (the correct form of a trivial name based, for example, on the modern surname "de Lessert" thus being *lesserti* not *delesserti*), save in those cases where the particle is actually attached to the modern surname in question (as, for example, in the case of the surname "Dujardin") or, where, by long custom, it forms an integral portion of the surname (as, for example, in the case of the surname "De Geer"), in either of which cases the particle is to be retained when forming a trivial based thereon, the correct form for trivial names based, for example, on the modern surnames cited above being in the first case *dujardini* (not *jardini*) and in the second case *degeeri* (not *geeri*);

(b) that, where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage which commences with the particle "Mc", the letter "a" should be inserted between the letter "m" and the letter "c";

(4) agreed to recommend that provision should be made in the Article which was to replace the existing Article 35 to secure that, where a trivial name is based upon the surname of a modern personage, the first part of which consists of the particle "Mac" or "Mc", as the case may be, the trivial name so formed is to be rejected as a homonym if there is a species or subspecies which was either originally described, or is now placed, in the same genus, which is based upon the surname of another modern personage which is identical with the surname on which the later published trivial name is based, save that the first part of the surname consists, as the case may be, of the particle "Mc" or the particle "Mac" and that a corresponding addition should be made to Article 34 in relation to generic names so formed;

(5) agreed to recommend that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 15, urging any author, when proposing to publish a trivial name based upon the surname of a modern personage, whose surname is a compound name consisting

of two surnames, whether or not, linked together by a hyphen, to give serious consideration, in the interests of brevity in nomenclature, to the possibility of basing the trivial name upon one only of the two surnames of which the compound surname is composed, and, if this course is found to be feasible, to give preference to whichever is the better known of the surnames in question (for example, if it were decided to base a trivial name upon the surname "Guérin-Méneville" but to make use for this purpose of one only of the surnames of which that compound surname is composed, preference should be given to the name "Guérin" by which this French naturalist was commonly known rather than to the name "Méneville", the trivial name selected being thus *guérini*, though the trivial name *ménevillei* would in such a case also be permissible.)

Seventeen propositions submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) : review of position regarding

12. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) suggested that it would be convenient if at this stage the Commission were to review the position reached in regard to the propositions, seventeen in number, which had been submitted to them by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) for consideration, if possible, during the present (Paris) Session. The propositions in question¹ were concerned with the following matters :—

- (1) the question whether the names published in Clerck's *Aranei svecici* should be made available for nomenclatorial purposes, notwithstanding the fact that they were published in 1757, i.e. before the starting point of zoological nomenclature as prescribed in Article 26 of the *Règles* (file Z.N. (S.) 238);
- (2) the insertion in the *Règles* of a provision recognising a Law of Prescription which would prevent the Law of Priority from upsetting well-established names in favour of names which had long been forgotten (file Z.N. (S.) 359);
- (3) the partial suspension of the Law of Homonymy for the purpose of protecting well-established generic names (file Z.N. (S.) 359);
- (4) the deletion from Article 13 of the option to use a capital when writing the first letter of certain trivial names (file Z.N. (S.) 352);

¹ For the text of Professor Bonnet's propositions, see 1950, *Bull. Zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 171-199.

- (5) the insertion in Articles 14 and 15 of provisions designed to remove certain ambiguities and to fill in certain gaps (file Z.N. (S.) 352);
- (6) the insertion of a *Recommandation* in Article 11, urging authors not to publish trivial names consisting of words already used as such for species in allied genera, families or Orders (file Z.N. (S.) 352);
- (7) the deletion from Article 15 of the option to use a hyphen joining together the two parts of a compound trivial name (file Z.N. (S.) 352);
- (8) the insertion of three new Articles dealing with the formation of compound trivial names (file Z.N. (S.) 390);
- (9) the agreement of trivial names, when adjectives, with the gender of the generic names with which they combined (file Z.N. (S.) 352);
- (10) the insertion in the *Règles* of a new Article dealing with polymorphism of certain words used as trivial names (file Z.N. (S.) 356);
- (11) the need for co-ordination of the provisions of Articles 19 and 32 of the *Règles* (file Z.N. (S.) 352);
- (12) the need for avoiding the selection, as names, of words which were either inharmonious or unduly long or which carried a bizarre meaning (files Z.N. (S.) 297 and 352);
- (13) the amendment and clarification of Article 22 (file Z.N. (S.) 352);
- (14) the deletion from Article 14 of the obsolete *Recommandation* relating to the abbreviation of authors' names (file Z.N. (S.) 352);
- (15) the addition to Article 14 of a provision relating to the formation of adjectival trivial names having a geographical meaning and ending in the termination “-ensis” (file Z.N. (S.) 391);
- (16) the modification of the *Recommandation* to Article 20 of the *Règles* (file Z.N. (S.) 392);
- (17) a minor amendment of the document which at present figures as Section “F” of the *Appendice* to the *Règles* (file Z.N. (S.) 393).

Continuing, the Acting President said that, in view of the importance of, and the wide interest taken in, Professor Bonnet's Proposition 1, he proposed in his capacity as President of the Section, to call upon Professor Bonnet to make a statement on Clerck's Arachnid names at an early meeting of the Section. He further proposed that, in the

light of the general discussion so afforded, the Commission should consider this proposal in detail at a later meeting during the present Session. Professor Bonnet's Propositions 2 and 3 were closely related to one another and could be conveniently considered together with the proposal on the same subject which stood in the name of Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark). These three proposals would, therefore, be considered in the first instance at a meeting of the Section on Nomenclature, after which the Commission would be asked to formulate recommendations for the approval of the Section. The Commission had already taken decisions on the issues raised in Professor Bonnet's Propositions 4 and 14 and on the first and third parts of his Proposition 12, when they had had Paper I.C.(48) 11 under consideration, while Propositions 5, 6, and 7 had been dealt with at the present meeting. He (the Acting President) proposed to deal, in papers shortly to be circulated in the I.C.(48) series, with Professor Bonnet's Propositions 9, 11, 13, and the second part of his Proposition 12. He suggested therefore that the consideration of these Propositions should be deferred until the relevant I.C.(48) papers were available. The subject dealt with in Professor Bonnet's Proposition 10 was closely connected with the general problem raised by Article 19 and he (the Acting President) suggested therefore that the subject raised by Professor Bonnet in this Proposition should be referred to the general study of Article 19 which, when considering Paper I.C.(48) 11, the Commission had agreed should be undertaken by the Secretary to the Commission before the next meeting of the Congress. The Acting President suggested that the consideration of the remaining Propositions submitted by Professor Bonnet (namely Propositions 8 and 15-17) should be deferred until after the close of the present Congress.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

as regards the 17 propositions submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet :—

- (a) that, in view of the decisions already taken, no further action was called for as regards the propositions numbered 4 to 7 and 14 and the first and third parts of the proposition numbered 12;
- (b) that, having regard to the close connection between the subject dealt with in the proposition numbered 10 and the general problem raised by Article 19, the question raised in that proposition should be included among the questions to be studied in the examination of Article 19 which it had been agreed at the

meeting noted in the margin should be undertaken by the Secretary to the Commission with a view to the consideration of the whole matter during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress;

- (c) that the propositions numbered 1 to 3, 9, 11 and 13, together with the second part of the proposition numbered 12, should be considered at later meetings during the present Session in the manner proposed by the Acting President;
- (d) that the consideration of the propositions numbered 8 and 15 to 17 should be deferred until after the close of the present Session of meetings.

**Article 18
(nomenclature of
hybrids): drafting
amendments**

(Previous reference :
*Lisbon Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 5*)

13. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N. (S.) 21) for the insertion of certain drafting amendments in the provisions of Article 18, relating to the nomenclature of hybrids submitted by Dr. Hans Bytinsky-Salz (Rovigno d'Istria), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in Point (24) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

It was explained that the sole object of this proposal was to eliminate certain drafting defects in the existing text of Article 18 of the *Règles*. This proposal which had been published in 1933 (*Int. Ent. Z.* **27** : 153–162) had been received by the Commission later in the same year. It was unfortunate that they had not found it possible to deal with this application at their meeting held in Lisbon in 1935. It should be made clear also that a specific name given under Article 18(d) was subject to all the provisions governing specific names.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that Article 18 of the *Règles* should be amended in the manner indicated below :—

(a) *Section (a), at end add:*—“In the case of a hybrid between two species belonging to the same genus, the trivial names of the two parents united by the sign of multiplication may be placed in round brackets (parentheses) and cited immediately after the name of the common genus. Example : *Tetrao* (*tetrix* *x urogallus*).”

(b) *Section (b), at end:*—Substitute the words “who first published a description of the hybrid as such” for the words “who first recognised the hybrid form as such”;

(c) *Section (c), after the example at present cited:*
add the words :—

Tetrao tetrix

“ or ————— x *Gallus gallus* ”
Tetrao urogallus

(d) *Section (d), at the beginning* :—Substitute the words “ When the identity of either of the parents of a hybrid is not uncontestedly established both as to species and sex ” for the words “ when the parents of a hybrid are not known as such ” and after the words “ specific name ” add the words : “ a name so given being subject to all the provisions governing specific names.”

Names published
either anonymously or over
initials only :
status under the
Law of Priority

14. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the status of names (generic and trivial) published either anonymously or over initials only (file Z.N. (S.) 84) and in this connection had before them a note submitted by the Secretary in Point (25) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

It was clearly most undesirable that new names should be published either anonymously or over initials only, for the publication of a name in this way made it difficult for later authors clearly to cite that name. On the other hand there was nothing in the existing text of Article 25 (Law of Priority) to suggest, still less to prescribe, that a name published in this way forfeited the rights which it would otherwise have possessed under the Law of Priority. It was suggested that Article 25 should be amended to secure that in future a name so published should have no rights under the Law of Priority until such later date as it was republished by an author whose name was stated in the paper in which the name was so re-published. It was felt, however, that it would not be practicable or desirable to give retroactive effect to this provision, for in the older literature there was a number of important books which had been published anonymously. One example of such a book was the celebrated work on the Lepidoptera of Europe, commonly known as the “ Vienna Catalogue ” which was published anonymously in 1775 by (as was now known) the two Viennese priests Schiffermüller and Denis. If this book were to be ruled out for the purposes of the Law of Priority, numerous well-known names would cease to be available, the type localities of many other species would have to be changed and great confusion would ensue. It was accordingly proposed that the new provision ruling out for availability names until they had been published in a work, in which the author’s name was given should come into effect as from the same future date as that selected as

the date on which other new provisions now proposed to be inserted in the *Règles* should become operative.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that Article 25 should be amended in such a way as to make it clear :—

- (a) that, when, *prior to midnight Greenwich Mean Time, 31st December 1950/1st January 1951*, a name belonging to a category, to which Article 25 applies, is published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials only, that name, notwithstanding its having been so published, is to be accepted as having availability under Article 25, provided that its manner of publication satisfies the requirements specified in that Article ;
- (b) that, when, *subsequent to the point of time specified in (a) above*, a name belonging to a category, to which Article 25 applies, is published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials only, that name is to have no availability under Article 25 until such later date as it is re-published by the same or some other author in a book or paper in which that author's name is given ;
- (c) that the fact of re-publication by a named author shall be sufficient to confer availability upon the name in question for the purposes of Article 25, provided either :—
 - (i) that the author by whom the name is republished complies, when so doing, with the requirements specified in Provisos (b) and (c) to Article 25, or
 - (ii) in cases where the foregoing requirements had been duly complied with in the earlier book or paper in which the name had been published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials only, that the author by whom the name is republished cites, when so doing, a bibliographical reference to the book or paper in which the name had previously been published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials only ;
- (d) that, when a name originally published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials acquires availability under Article 25

through being republished in the manner specified in (c) above, that name shall rank for purposes of priority as from the date on which it so acquired such availability and shall be attributed to the author of the book or paper, the publication of which conferred that availability upon the name in question ;

- (2) that a *Recommandation* should be inserted in the portion of Article 25 containing the provisions specified in (1) above, recommending authors, when citing a book or paper which was published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials only, but the author of which is known from other sources or when citing the name of a taxonomic unit published in such a book or paper prior to the date specified in (1)(a) above, to place square brackets round the name of the author of the book or paper concerned or, as the case may be, round the name of the author of the taxonomic unit cited, in order to indicate that the work or name concerned had originally been published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials only ;
- (3) that a *Recommandation* should be added to the portion of Article 25 containing the provisions specified in (1) above recommending that every author, on validating a name previously published anonymously, over a pseudonym or over initials only by republishing that name in the manner specified in (1) above, should make it clear in the book or paper concerned that he is conferring availability upon the name in question and should notify the fact that availability under Article 25 has been so conferred upon the name in question to a literature-recording serial such as the "Zoological Record" as soon as possible after the publication of the book or paper concerned, either by sending to that serial a marked copy of that book or paper or otherwise, so that the fact that the name in question has acquired availability under Article 25 may be recorded in the next issue of that serial ;
- (4) that the provisions in (1) to (3) above should apply, *mutatis mutandis* to names formed under Article 4.

Article 25
 (meaning of the
 expression
 "divulgué dans une
 publication")

15. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a historical account of the deliberations of the Commission since 1910 on the question of the meaning to be attached to the expression "divulgué dans une publication" as used in Article 25, submitted by the Secretary to the Commission.

together with proposals for action, in Point (26) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

The lack of an authoritative definition of what constitutes publication for the purposes of zoological nomenclature was a constant source of difficulty for zoologists, and the failure of the Commission adequately to grapple with this problem had led to much well-merited criticism. A start had been made in 1910 (in *Opinion 15*) and the matter had been carried a little further two years later when in 1912 *Opinion 51* had been published. Nothing more was done in this matter until some years after the close of the war of 1914–18. In the late twenties, however, the subject was extensively discussed between the members of the Commission and in 1930 this subject (which by then had been given the reference number “1930H”) was the subject of a tentative proposal which had shortly before been published by Dr. C. W. Stiles, then Secretary to the Commission (*Trans. IV int. Congr. Entom.* : 628–629). Though brought before the Commission at their meeting held in Padua in 1930, this matter was not discussed at that meeting. It was not even placed on the Agenda for the Lisbon meeting in 1935. Although the proposal put forward in 1930 had been shelved at that time, the proposal itself raised a number of valuable points to which careful consideration had been given during the recent re-examination of this subject. The correspondence which had led up to that proposal (file Z.N.(S.)84), though incomplete, had also proved of great interest.

The proposition laid down in 1910 (in *Opinion 15*) was that: “Publication, in the sense of the Code, consists in the public issue of printed matter.” In 1912 (in *Opinion 51*) the Commission had re-stated the proposition enunciated two years earlier and had added: “The qualifying word ‘public’ in this definition indicates that the printed matter in question is not intended for special persons only or for a limited time, but that it is given to the world, or used in the nature of a permanent record.” In the 36 years which had elapsed since the publication of the more recent of these *Opinions*, a development had occurred which had not been anticipated by the Commission, namely the publication—if it could properly be called “publication”—of new names in books and papers reproduced by some method (e.g. photographic and lithographic processes of various kinds, mimeographing and similar systems) other than printing. Some of these methods were extremely unsatisfactory but others attained a high degree of technical excellence. It would be unreasonable to accept new names appearing in papers reproduced by methods falling in the first of these

classes, but it would be equally unreasonable to reject new names appearing in papers reproduced by methods falling in the second of these classes, some of the methods of reproduction being fully as good as printing, the finished paper being indeed better than some papers reproduced by actual printing. The preliminary definitions given in 1910 and 1912 needed, therefore, to be reviewed from this point of view.

The proposals now submitted had been the subject of extensive consultations with specialists, both by correspondence and by personal discussion notably during the visit paid by the Secretary to the United States and Canada at the end of 1947. These consultations had led to certain modifications of the proposals previously considered. For example, it was evident that it would not be appropriate to require that, in order for a paper to qualify as having been "published," at least some copies must have been placed on sale, for it had then been ascertained that certain University institutions in the United States distributed the whole edition of their publications free of charge, no copies being placed on sale. It would clearly be wrong so to define "publication" as to render invalid, because not "published," new names appearing in papers which had been "divulgués" in this way.

Finally, the whole subject had been carefully reviewed in order to exclude provisions of a "ritualistic" character, that is to say technical provisions, the non-compliance with which would have the effect of invalidating names. With this object in view, the proposals had been drawn up in two groups: (1) mandatory provisions specifying the minimum standard which must be complied with in order to enable a book or paper to qualify as having been published and therefore to ensure that a new name which appeared therein had been duly "divulgué dans une publication"; (2) non-mandatory provisions to be inserted in Article 25 as *Recommandations* setting out the ideal standard to be aimed at.

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

(1) to recommend:—

(a) that, either in Article 25 or at some other appropriate point in the *Règles*, there should be inserted provisions prescribing:—

(i) that a name made public, *prior to midnight G.M.T. (Greenwich Mean Time)*, 31st December, 1950/1st January, 1951, is to be deemed to have been made public in a publication

(“divulgué dans une publication”) only if the document containing the name satisfies both of the following conditions :—

(a) it must have been reproduced either by printing or by some other mechanical method of reproduction which secures that every copy is identical with every other copy ;

(β) it must be a document issued for purposes of record and therefore of consultation by interested persons and must accordingly not be a document issued for exclusive consideration by special persons only, or only for particular purposes or for a limited time ;

(ii) that a name made public, *subsequent to the point of time specified in (i) above*, is to be deemed to have been made public in a publication (“divulgué dans une publication”), only if the document containing the name satisfies all of the following conditions :—

(a) it must have been made public in conditions which satisfy the requirements both of section (α) and of section (β) of (i) above ;

(β) it must be reproduced on paper, and with ink, of quality and durability sufficient to offer a reasonable prospect of permanency ;

(γ) where the document containing the name is distributed by, or on behalf of, its author to certain selected persons, at least some copies must also be placed on sale or made available for issue free of charge to any institution or person who may apply for a copy ;

- (iii) that, where there is any reasonable doubt as to whether a given book or paper has been made public in conditions which satisfy the requirements of section (i) or section (ii) above, as the case may be, and therefore as to whether new names contained therein have been made public in a publication ("divulgué dans une publication"), the question should be referred forthwith to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision;
- (b) that, associated with the provisions specified in (a) above, provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* making it clear that a new name is not to be deemed to have been made public in a publication ("divulgué dans une publication") if the only action or actions to make that name public consists of :—
 - (i) the deposit of the paper containing the new name in a public library or in the library of a scientific institution, however that document may have been reproduced;
 - (ii) the mention of the new name in a paper presented orally before a meeting of any kind;
 - (iii) the affixing of the new name on the label attached to a museum specimen;
- (c) that the provisions specified in (b) above should be linked with the undermentioned provisions which it had already been agreed at the present Session should be inserted in the *Règles*, namely the provisions relating to the status of a new name when the only action taken to make that name public consists of :—
 - (i) the distribution of printer's proof sheets of the book or paper containing the new name (Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 19(a));
 - (ii) the distribution of *separata* in advance of the appearance of the paper in question in the book or serial, for inclusion in which it was printed (Paris Session, 6th Meeting, Conclusion 19(b));

- (iii) the introduction of the new name in a note in explanation of a photograph or other illustration, where that note and accompanying photograph or other illustration is merely distributed by the author to colleagues or students or inserted by him in separates of a paper which did not itself contain the new name accompanied by an indication (Paris Session 6th Meeting, Conclusion 19(c)) ;
- (iv) the inclusion of the new name in a book or paper published anonymously or over a pseudonym or initials only, where that book or paper is published subsequent to midnight (G.M.T.), 31st December, 1950/1st January, 1951 (Paris Session, 7th Meeting, Conclusion 14(1)(b)) ;
- (d) that there should be added to the provisions specified in (a) above a *Recommandation*, urging institutions and individuals responsible for the publication of books and papers affecting the status of names to secure that there appears in the book or, as the case may be, the part of the book or serial affecting, or comprising papers affecting, such names, a clear statement specifying :—
 - (i) the name of the institution, firm or individual responsible for publishing the book or serial concerned ;
 - (ii) the address from which the book or serial concerned may be purchased or, where the book or serial is not placed on sale, the address from which a free copy may be obtained ;
 - (iii) the price for which a copy may be purchased, in those cases where the book or serial is placed on sale ;
- (e) that there should be added to the provisions specified in (a) above a *Recommandation* urging institutions, authors and other persons responsible for the publication of books and serials on zoological or palaeontological subjects to avoid publishing anything affecting the status of names

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 3(3) (a)
(ii))

in books or serials reproduced by any method other than printing;

(f) that there should be added to the provisions specified in (a) above a *Recommandation* urging authors not to publish in the non-scientific press zoological or palaeontological papers containing new names;

(g) that the first sentence (relating to the languages recommended as the only languages to be used for describing new systematic units) of Section "A" of the *Appendice* to the *Règles* (in future to be known, in accordance with the decision noted in margin, as the "Second Schedule" to the *Règles*) should be deleted and that, in order to give greater prominence to this important question, there should be added to Article 25 a *Recommandation* urging that in every book or paper containing the name of a new genus, subgenus, species, subspecies or infra-subspecific form or a new name for any unit belonging to any of the foregoing categories, the existing name of which requires to be replaced under the Law of Homonymy, the description, definition or indication published for the unit to which the new name is given should be published in one or other of the five following languages, namely, German, English, French, Italian or Latin, in addition to the language in which the book or paper is written, when that language is not one of the five languages specified above;

(2) to repeal *Opinions* 15 and 51 for interpretative purposes.

Names of new taxonomic units published in abstracts in advance of the paper or of the portion of the paper containing the description of the new unit : status of

16. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a communication submitted by Dr. Waldo L. Schmitt (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.) regarding the status of names published in abstracts in advance of the paper containing the description of the new taxonomic unit concerned (file Z.N.(S.)262), together with a proposal on this subject submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (27) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

Formerly, new names had often been published by learned societies in abstracts printed and distributed before the meeting at which the paper containing the new names

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.

was to be presented. This practice had led to difficulties, for it had often involved the publication either of *nomina nuda* or of names of genera and species so inadequately characterised that it was a matter of doubt and dispute whether the name had been published with an indication, within the meaning of Article 25 of the *Règles*. It had, moreover, often been a matter of difficulty to determine whether a new name made public in this way had been "divulgué dans une publication" within the meaning of Article 25 and therefore whether it possessed any availability under the Law of Priority. This method of publishing new names was open to strong objection and should be discouraged. Similar objections applied to the publication of a new name in an abstract or summary at the head of a paper and to the publication of a new name in the introductory portion of a paper in advance of the description of the new taxonomic unit concerned.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 25 of the *Règles*, urging institutions and individuals responsible for the publication of books or papers containing new names to refrain from publishing those names for the first time either (1) in abstracts issued in advance of the publication of the book or paper containing the description of the taxonomic unit so named or (2) in abstracts placed at the head of the book or paper containing the description of the new taxonomic unit or in the introductory portions of the book or paper concerned in advance of the actual description of the new taxonomic unit.

**Generic and
trivial names
first published in
keys : status of**

17. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a communication submitted by Dr. Waldo L. Schmitt (Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C.) regarding the status of generic and trivial names first published in keys (file Z.N.(S.)262), together with a proposal on this subject submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (28) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

It would clearly be wrong to refuse to accept names of new genera or species when those names were first published in keys. Nevertheless, this method of publishing new names was open to objection, for this method of publication made it difficult, and, in the case of trivial names, virtually impossible, properly to comply with the requirements of Article 25 of the *Règles*. It was desirable therefore that this method of publishing new names should be discouraged.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that a *Recommandation* should be added to Article 25 urging authors not to publish new names for the first time in keys, or, if it were desired to publish such names in a book or paper which contained, or consisted primarily of, a key, to publish those names with accompanying descriptions at the beginning of the book or paper concerned and in advance of the key.

Article 25 (criteria to be adopted in determining the date of publication of a given book or paper)

(Previous reference,
Paris Session,
7th Meeting,
Conclusion 15)

18. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a note on the question of the criteria to be adopted in determining the date of publication of a given book or paper, submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (29) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

It was explained that the question of the meaning of the expression "date of publication" and the criteria to be adopted for determining, for any given book or paper, what was the date of its publication, had received some consideration from the Commission when, during the inter-war years, they had examined the cognate problem of the criteria to be adopted for determining whether or not a given book or paper had been published at all and therefore whether new names appearing therein had been duly made public in a publication ("divulgué dans une publication") for the purposes of Article 25 (file Z.N.(S.)84). No effective progress had, however, been made in this matter and zoologists had been left without any guidance as to the line which they should follow when it was impossible to determine with certainty the relative dates either of two names, each applying to the same unit, or of the same name applied to different taxonomic units. The object of the present proposals was to fill this gap by inserting in the *Règles* simple rules which followed the general lines of the unofficial practice of zoologists in this matter.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

the insertion in or near Article 25 of the following provisions :—

- (a) the date on which copies of a work (the expression "work" for the purpose of the present provision and of provisions (b) and (c) below, to include any independent work or serial publication or, in either case, a volume or part thereof) produced in conditions which constitute publication are mailed to subscribers or are placed on sale or, where the whole edition is distributed free of charge, are mailed to institutions and individuals to whom such free copies are normally distributed, is to be taken to be the date of publication of that work.
- (b) where a work bears a date purporting to specify or to indicate the date of publication, that date is to be deemed to be correct, unless and until evidence is published showing that date to be incorrect, in which

case the work or any specified portion thereof is to be deemed to have been published on the latest date (whether earlier or later than the date specified or indicated in the work itself) that is compatible with the evidence so adduced ;

(c) where there is no evidence to suggest that the date specified or indicated in a given work is incorrect, the date as on which that work is to be deemed to have been published is to be determined in accordance with the following rules :—

(i) a work which bears a statement of the year, month and day of publication is to be deemed to have been published on the date so specified ;

(ii) a work which bears a statement of the year and month, but not of the day of publication is to be deemed to have been published on the last day of the month so specified, save where evidence is published showing that publication took place during the month in question on some day prior to the last day, in which case the work in question is to be deemed to have been published on the latest day compatible with the evidence so adduced ;

(iii) a work which bears a statement of the year but not of the month and day of publication is to be deemed to have been published on the last day of the last month of that year, save where evidence is published showing that publication of the whole or of some portion or portions of the work concerned took place during the year in question but prior to the last day thereof, in which case the work or the portion or portions concerned is, or are, to be deemed to have been published on the latest date compatible with the evidence so adduced, any portion of such a work in respect of which no such supplementary evidence regarding the date of publication is forthcoming is to be deemed, as provided above, to have been published on the last day of the last month of the year concerned ;

(iv) a work which contains no evidence regarding the date on which it was published, except a range of years, specified on the title page or elsewhere, is to be deemed to have been published on the last day of the last month of the later, or, as the case may be, the latest of the years so specified, save that, where evidence is published showing that a portion, or that portions, of that work, was, or, as the case may be, were, published prior to the date specified above, each portion concerned is to be deemed to have been published on the latest date compatible with the evidence so adduced, any portion of the work in respect of which no such supplementary evidence regarding the date of publication is forthcoming to be deemed, as provided above, to have been published on the last day of the last month of the later, or, as the case may be, the latest of the years specified in the range of years given in work concerned ;

(d) where a work contains no direct evidence regarding the date on which it, or any portion of it, was published, the date of publication is to be determined

by reference to such evidence as may be available from other sources, including evidence afforded by the date of publication of the first published book or serial publication or portion thereto containing a reference to the work in question or any portion thereof, the date to be adopted as the date of publication to be the latest date compatible with such evidence.

**Date of publication
of a name :
method of citation
recommended**

19. THE COMMISSION turned next to consider the proposals for the insertion in the *Règles de Recommandations* regarding the method of notation to be adopted by authors when citing the date of publication of a given name, for the purpose of distinguishing between (1) a date expressly specified in the volume in which the name concerned was first published, (2) a date ascertained from indirect evidence obtained from an examination of the volume in question, and (3) a date ascertained solely by reference to external sources (file Z.N.(S.)84). In this connection, the Commission had before them certain proposals submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in the second portion of Point (29) of Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

It was pointed out in discussion that care would be needed in the choice of the wording to be used in the *Règles* to give effect to the present proposals, owing to the fact that the expression "bracket" was used in different senses in England and America, in the former country this expression having the meaning of a sign, either semilunar or square, used to divide off certain words in a sentence from other parts of the sentence, the word "bracket" being qualified by the adjective "round" or "square" according to the form of the sign used, whereas in America only the square sign (called a "square bracket" in England) was denoted by the expression "bracket," the semilunar form being denoted by the expression "parenthesis."

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that there should be added to the mandatory provisions recommended in Conclusion 18 above a *Recommandation* urging authors when citing the date of publication of a name :—

- (a) to refrain from placing either semilunar signs (i.e. parentheses or round brackets) or square signs (i.e. square brackets) round the date of publication of a name, if that date is given on the title page of the volume containing the name or in an express statement regarding the date of publication of the volume or of the parts in which that volume was published, where such a statement is included in the volume itself;

- (b) to enclose within semilunar signs (i.e. parentheses or round brackets) the date of publication of a name or a part of that date (e.g. the month of publication), where that date or that part of that date cannot be ascertained directly in the manner specified in (a) above, but can be ascertained indirectly by reference to other evidence afforded by the volume in which the name was originally published, e.g. evidence afforded by dates either printed on the first pages of individual signatures or on the wrappers (covers) in which successive portions of the volume were published ;
- (c) to enclose within square signs (i.e. square brackets) the date of publication of a name or a part of such a date (e.g. the month of publication), where that date or that part of a date cannot be ascertained either directly or indirectly in the manner specified respectively in (a) and (b) above and can be determined only by reference to external sources of evidence.

Article 25 (priority to be accorded to a name published in a work issued in instalments where that name is published on one date and the relevant description or part of it at a later date)

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
11th Meeting,
Conclusion 12)

20. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the question of the priority to be accorded to names published in books or journals issued in instalments, in those cases where a new name appears in one instalment and the description of the taxonomic unit so named or a part of that description appears in a later instalment (file Z.N.(S.)352). In this connection, the Commission had before them a proposal submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (30) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

No difficulty arose where a name was published without any description, definition or indication in the portion of the text of a book issued in one instalment, the whole of the description, definition or indication being published in a later instalment, for in that case the name, as published in the earlier instalment, was a *nomen nudum*. Clearly in such a case the name in question could rank for purposes of priority only from the date of publication of the later instalment containing the description, definition or indication of the taxonomic unit to which the new name was applied. There was, however, a real difficulty in those cases where a new name appeared in one instalment of a work and that instalment contained part only of the description, definition or indication, the remaining part appearing on the first page of the next instalment. In such cases the criterion to be applied should be whether the descriptive matter given in the first instalment

was sufficient to afford an indication for the purposes of Article 25 of the *Règles*. The question was of some importance, for owing to the interval which sometimes occurred between the publication of successive parts of a given work, cases might arise where the relative priority of two names for (say) the same species or subspecies might turn on the answer to be given to the foregoing question.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that there should be added to Article 25 a provision that, where a new taxonomic unit to which that Article applies is described in a book or serial which is published in parts and the name of the taxonomic unit is published in one instalment and the description, definition or indication relating to the taxonomic unit so named is published partly in the instalment in which the name is published and partly in the next succeeding instalment, the name is to rank for purposes of the Law of Priority as from the date of publication of the later published of the parts concerned, except where the portion of the description, definition or indication contained in the earlier published part is sufficient to comply with the requirements of Article 25 ;
- (2) that there should be added to the mandatory provision recommended in (1) above a *Recommendation* urging institutions and individuals responsible for the publication of books or serials containing new names to ensure that, where a book or serial is published in parts, the description of a new taxonomic unit, belonging to a category to the names of which Article 25 applies, is not cut into two portions, the first portion being published at the end of one instalment and the remainder at the beginning of the next succeeding instalment.

**Article 25
(status of a
trivial name
published in
conjunction with a
generic name which
does not comply
with the
requirements of
Proviso (c))**

21. THE COMMISSION had under consideration communications in regard to the status of a trivial name published subsequent to 31st December, 1930, in cases where the generic name used in conjunction with the trivial name in question is invalid by reason of its not satisfying the requirements of Proviso (c) to Article 25 received (a) from President Karl Jordan and (b) from specialists in the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, D.C. (file Z:N.(S.)315), together with a note on the same subject submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (31) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

In view of the fact that doubts had been raised as to the correct interpretation of Article 25 in relation to trivial names published in the manner described above, it was clearly desirable that words should be inserted in Article 25 to make the position absolutely clear. As regards the nature of that action, it would clearly be "ritualistic" in the highest degree to prescribe that a trivial name published in the foregoing circumstances is invalid and possesses no status under the Law of Priority until such later time as it is republished in a binominal combination in which the generic name was a nomenclatorially available name. Moreover, such a decision would have the further serious disadvantage that it would make it necessary to provide also that a trivial name published in a binominal combination in which the generic name was invalid by reason of being a homonym was itself invalid until such later time as it was republished in combination with a generic name which was a nomenclatorially available name.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in Article 25 to make it clear that the status of a trivial name (specific, subspecific or infra-subspecific) is not adversely affected where the generic name with which it was combined when first published is a name which was itself either an unavailable name by reason of its having been published in conditions which do not satisfy the requirements of Article 25 (Law of Priority) (proviso (c) cases) or was invalid under the Law of Homonymy.

**Schedule replacing
the former
"Appendice"
to the "Règles":
proposed addition
to, of a section
on the
transliteration of
words from the
Cyrillic to the
Latin alphabet**

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 3(3)(a) (ii))

22. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)310) that there should be added to the *Appendice* to the *Règles* a section giving particulars as to the manner in which words belonging to languages using the Cyrillic alphabet should be transliterated into the Latin alphabet in cases where words belonging to such languages were selected to form the basis of generic or trivial names and had therefore to be Latinised in accordance with the provisions of Article 3. In this connection, the Commission had before it also a note submitted by the Secretary to the Commission in Point (32) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)14.

It was pointed out that the *Appendice* to the *Règles* (henceforward, as agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin, to be a Schedule to the *Règles*) contained a Section prescribing the manner in which words of Greek origin should be transliterated into the Latin alphabet in cases where such words required Latinisation as a preliminary to being used as generic or trivial names, and that it was

equally desirable to provide a corresponding Section relating to the transliteration for the same purpose of words belonging to languages using the Cyrillic alphabet. The rules governing the transliteration of such words were known to very few persons not personally acquainted with languages using the Cyrillic alphabet; the growing number of scientific names based upon such words made it increasingly necessary to provide guidance on this subject.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 3)

- (1) that there should be added to the Schedule which it had been agreed should replace the existing *Appendice* to the *Règles* a Section setting out the manner in which words belonging to languages using the Cyrillic alphabet should be transliterated into the Latin alphabet, for the purpose of forming zoological names in accordance with the provisions of Article 3;
- (2) that, consequential upon (1) above, the Section forming Section G to the present *Appendice* should be amended so as to exclude from the scope of the recommendations set forth therein geographical and proper names originating in languages using the Cyrillic or Greek alphabets (for the first of which provision would be made under (1) above, while, for the second, provision had already been made in Section F of the *Appendice*) and to secure that the recommendations set forth in this Section should relate to the proper method of transliteration into the Latin alphabet only of geographical and proper names originating in languages which either used alphabets other than those specified above or which had no recognised alphabet.

**Eighth Meeting of
the Commission
during its Paris
Session : date and
time noted**

(Previous reference:
Paris Session:
6th Meeting,
Conclusion 77)

23. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) proposed that, now that the examination of Commission Paper I.C.(48)14 had been completed, the Commission should adjourn for the day. As already arranged, the next meeting of the Commission, which would be held concurrently with the First Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature, would take place on the morning of the following day (Friday, 23rd July, 1948) at 0900 hours.

THE COMMISSION took note of the above arrangements.

(The Commission thereupon adjourned at 2250 hours)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

*Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology,
Paris, 21st-27th July, 1948*

CONCLUSIONS of the Eighth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Friday, 23rd July, 1948, at 0900 hours

(Meeting held concurrently with the First Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature)

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
Professor E. Beltrán (Mexico)
Professor H. Boschma (Netherlands)
Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
Professor L. di Caporiacco (Italy)
Professor Harold Kirby (U.S.A.)
Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
Professor R. Spärck (Denmark)
Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

M. H. Berthet (France)
Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
M. André Chavan (France)
Mr. J. Delacour (U.S.A.)
Mr. C. F. dos Passos (U.S.A.)
Professor E. Raymond Hall (U.S.A.)
Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)
Mr. T. C. S. Morrison-Scott (United Kingdom)
Miss Louise Russell (U.S.A.)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*
Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer*

Procedure proposed
to be adopted at the
present (eighth)
Meeting

1. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that the present meeting of the Commission was a public meeting held concurrently with the first meeting of the Section on Nomenclature. All the matters which would be brought forward would be of interest to the Commission as a body, and he proposed therefore that the Commission should remain in continuous session throughout the meeting. He (the Acting President) anticipated that matters might be brought before the Section during the joint meeting on which the Commission might

feel that, if they were given the necessary opportunity, they would be able to reach an immediate decision which could then be reported back to the Section forthwith. If the discussion were to develop in this way, it was his intention, in his capacity as President of the Section, to invite the Section formally to adjourn to enable the Commission to consider matters so brought forward. Those members of the Section who were not members also of the Commission would remain in their places during any such adjournment and would be free, as at the previous public meetings of the Commission, to take part in the discussion of the Commission to such extent as they might desire.

THE COMMISSION :—

took note of, and approved, the procedure proposed by the Acting President.

**Emendation to
Psolos of the
spelling of the
generic name
Psodos Treitschke,
1827 (Class Insecta,
Order Lepidoptera):
M. H. Berthet's
proposal**

2. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by M. H. Berthet (Paris, France) that they should render an *Opinion* declaring that under Article 19 of the *Règles* the spelling of the generic name *Psodos* Treitschke, 1827 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) should be emended to *Psolos* (file Z.N.(S.)362).²

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to render an *Opinion* stating that the spelling *Psoidos* Treitschke, 1825, and the spelling *Psodos* Treitschke, 1827 (Class Insecta, Order Lepidoptera) were erroneous and should be emended to *Psolos* under the provisions of Article 19 of the *Règles*.
- (2) to place the name *Psolos* (emend. of *Psoidos* and *Psodos*) Treitschke, 1825 in Ochsenheimer, *Schmett. Europa* 5 (Abth. 2): 434 (type species : *Phalaena equestrata* Fabricius, 1777, *Gen. Ins.* : 288) (type species selected by Duponchel, 1829, in Godart, *Hist. nat. Lépid. France* 7(2): 112) on the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology."

**Extension, and
incorporation in
the "Règles", of
the provisions
relating to the
Commission's
plenary powers :
Dr. H. Lemche's
proposal**

3. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication (file Z.N.(S.)359) submitted by Dr. Henning Lemche (Copenhagen, Denmark) on behalf not only of himself but also of a large group of Scandinavian zoologists, in which the applicants asked that there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision embodying, and at the same time expand-

² For the text of the communication made by M. Berthet, see page 157 of Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 3–5 of Volume 5.

ing the scope of, the provisions of the Resolution adopted by the Ninth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Monaco in 1913, under which plenary powers to suspend the provisions of the *Règles* in certain cases were conferred upon the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature.³

(See Section on
Nomenclature
Paris Session
1st Meeting,
Minute 3)

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
3rd Meeting,
Conclusion 7)

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
3rd Meeting,
Conclusions 1-6, 8)

A long discussion (which is fully reported in the Minutes of the Meeting of the Section on Nomenclature) then ensued, in the course of which the ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING), in his capacity as President of the Section, submitted for approval the more modest proposals for dealing with the problem of the plenary powers which the Commission had agreed to submit when they had had Commission Paper I.C.(48)5 under consideration, together with the proposals of the Commission for the reform of the composition of the Commission (based upon the proposals in Commission Paper I.C.(48)3) and for the introduction of improvements in the procedure of the Commission when dealing with applications submitted to it for decision (based on the proposals submitted in Commission Paper I.C.(48)4). At the conclusion of this discussion, Mr. LEMCHE (Denmark) intimated that, while the proposals submitted by the Commission for the reform of the plenary powers procedure did not go as far as he and his colleagues had advocated, he recognised that the reformed procedure was a great improvement on that laid down in 1913. The Section on Nomenclature thereon unanimously approved the recommendations submitted by the Commission :—

THE COMMISSION took note :—

that, in view of the outcome of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature on the proposal for the extension of the plenary powers submitted by Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark), no action was called for on the part of the Commission.

Incorporation in
the "Règles"
of a provision
establishing a
Law of
Prescription
limiting the scope
of the Law of
Priority: proposals
of Dr. H. Lemche and
Professor P. Bonnet

4. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication (file Z.N.(S.)359) submitted by Dr. Henning Lemche (Copenhagen, Denmark) on behalf not only of himself but also of a large group of Scandinavian zoologists, in which the applicants asked that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* limiting the Law of Priority, in its application to names published prior to the year 1850 but not used subsequent to that date, by a Law of Prescription

³ For the text of the communication made by Dr. Henning Lemche, see pages 158, 159–161 of Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 5–13 of Volume 5.

which would prevent such names from being substituted for names currently in use.⁴ At the same time, the Commission and the Section had under consideration a similar proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France).⁵

(See Section on
Nomenclature,
Paris Session.
1st Meeting,
Minute 4)

In the course of a long discussion (which is reported in full in the Minutes of the Section on Nomenclature) it became evident that numerous members of the Section felt strongly that some appropriate means should be found to secure greater stability in nomenclature, even if this meant imposing some restriction upon the scope of the Law of Priority. No member of the Section spoke in favour of the continuance of the present system under which the Law of Priority not only failed to promote uniformity but was itself actively instrumental in leading to confusion and instability in nomenclature.

As regards the particular proposals under consideration, it was suggested by ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER N. D. RILEY (United Kingdom) that the Commission should be asked to consider, and report to the next Congress on, means to be adopted for banning the upsetting of well-known names through the digging-up of old names and the unearthing of old books containing forgotten names. The Acting President (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING), in his capacity as President of the Section on Nomenclature, supported the proposal made by Alternate Commissioner Riley. The subject before the Commission and the Section, was, he pointed out, one of outstanding importance to all systematic workers. It was essential therefore to ensure that full account was taken of all relevant considerations and also of all points of view. All those present at the meeting were in favour of action being taken to limit the harm which, as it seemed to them, resulted from the unfettered operation of the Law of Priority in its present form, but, as a communication which he had received from certain specialists at the Smithsonian Institution, Washington, clearly showed, there were others who pinned their hopes of ultimate uniformity in nomenclature upon that Law alone and who in consequence desired to strengthen that Law at the expense of the Commission's plenary powers.

Mr. JEAN DELACOUR (U.S.A.) said that the proposal to postpone a decision on this important matter could only be made acceptable if at the same time it were agreed that a *Recommandation* should at once be inserted in the *Règles* urging authors not to cause further instability in nomen-

⁴ For the text of the communication made by Dr. Henning Lemche, see pages 159-161 of Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 13-19 of Volume 5.

⁵ For the text of Professor Bonnet's paper, see pages 177-179 of Volume 3.

clature by upsetting well-known names in favour of long-forgotten names but instead at once to report to the Commission any case where the Law of Priority appeared to require the upsetting of a name in this way and to maintain in use the currently accepted name until such time as the Commission had decided whether the Law of Priority should be permitted to operate in the case in question.

Considerable further discussion took place, in which the importance of devising a satisfactory solution of the difficulties caused by the unfettered operation of the Law of Priority was stressed and, in some cases, regret was expressed at the prospect of a further period of four or five years during which no remedy would be available for countering the present ills. The view was expressed that the proposed *Recommandation* should single out for special mention as names requiring particular consideration names of importance in medicine, agriculture and other fields of applied biology.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to take note of the applications submitted (i) by Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark) and (ii) by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) in favour of the incorporation in the *Règles* of a provision recognising a Law of Prescription which would prohibit the replacement, on grounds of priority, of well-known names by names published long previously and not subsequently used for a long period ;
- (2) to invite the Secretary to the Commission to examine, in consultation with interested specialists, all means which might secure greater stability in zoological nomenclature and to submit a Report thereon, with recommendations, for consideration by the Commission at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress, with a view to the submission by the Commission of proposals for the insertion in the *Règles* of provisions to secure the end specified above ;
- (3) to recommend, without prejudice to the proposal to be submitted to the next meeting of the Congress in the report referred to in (2) above, that there should at once be inserted at an appropriate point in the *Règles* a provision :—
 - (a) that, where a worker discovers that a well-known name in common use, particularly a name of importance in medicine, agri-

culture, veterinary science or other applied fields of biology, is invalid under either the Law of Priority or the Law of Homonymy or, in the case of a generic name, has as its type species a species not commonly accepted as referable to the genus in question or to a segregate thereof, that worker should at once report the case to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for such action as the Commission may deem to be proper;

- (b) that in such cases neither the worker by whom the error in accepted practice is discovered nor any other worker should change that practice by substituting some other name for that in common use, until such time as the decision on the future status of the name in question is made known by the said Commission.

5. THE COMMISSION, jointly with the Section on Nomenclature, had under consideration a communication (file Z.N.(S.)397) submitted by Alternate Commissioner Enrique Beltrán (Mexico) on the subject of the nomenclature of Protozoan parasites of Man.⁶

ALTERNATE COMMISSIONER BELTRÁN pointed out that at the present time many of the Protozoan parasites of Man were known to bacteriologists by names which possessed only a *de facto* basis and were not in accordance with the provisions of the *Règles*. The situation so created was extremely unsatisfactory and should be rectified as quickly as possible. Alternate Commissioner Beltrán suggested the appointment of a committee of protozoologists charged with the duty of studying the nomenclature of Protozoa, particularly species parasitic on Man, with a view to the submission of recommendations to the Commission for the addition to the "Official List" of the names of genera, in those cases where it was found that the names in question were available under the *Règles* for use in the sense in which they were commonly employed, and in the case of names not found to be so available for validation by the Commission with a view to their being also placed on the "Official List."

In the course of his presentation of the foregoing problem, Alternate Commissioner Beltrán alluded to the need for the Commission to exclude taxonomic considerations when deciding whether to include generic names on the "Official

**Nomenclature of
Protozoan and
other parasites of
Man : need for
stabilisation :
Prof. E. Beltran's
communication**

(See Section on
Nomenclature,
Paris Session,
1st Meeting,
Minute 5)

⁶ For the text of the communication made by Alternate Commissioner Beltrán, see pages 162-163 of Volume 3 of this journal, and for the record of the discussion in the Section on Nomenclature, see pages 19-23 of Volume 5.

List." He therefore welcomed the action taken by the Commission in *Opinion 104*, when dealing with the names of the human malaria parasites, in avoiding any attempt to express an opinion on the question whether two genera or one genus only were involved. The Commission had, in his view, acted with wisdom on that occasion in placing on the "Official List" two generic names (*Plasmodium* and *Laverania*) for use for these parasites, the first by those specialists who regarded the quartan and aestivo-autumnal parasites as congeneric and by all specialists for the first of these parasites, the second for use for the aestivo-autumnal parasite by those specialists who regarded it as generically distinct from the quartan parasite.

In the subsequent discussion general agreement was expressed with the proposal submitted by Alternate Commissioner Beltrán that a special effort should be made to stabilise the names of parasites of importance in human medicine. It was felt that it was indefensible that the Laws of Priority and Homonymy, in which only systematic zoologists were interested, should be allowed to cause confusion and disturbance in the nomenclature of such species. On the other hand, it was most undesirable that the present situation, in which many such species were habitually known by names which were incorrect under the *Règles*, should be permitted to continue. For names of the kind under consideration there was a clear *prima facie* case for the use by the Commission of their plenary powers. The view was expressed also that the problem raised by Alternate Commissioner Beltrán regarding the nomenclature of parasites of Man was by no means confined to Protozoa; that there were numerous similar instances in Phyla other than Protozoa. It was agreed by all present that the proposals submitted by Alternate Commissioner Beltrán should be expanded to apply to the names of genera containing species parasitic on Man, irrespective of the Phyla to which they belonged.

On the question raised by Alternate Commissioner Beltrán regarding the need for the Commission to avoid taking, or appearing to take, a view on taxonomic issues, when placing generic names on the "Official List," the Commission, in agreement with the Section on Nomenclature, decided that, in future, in order to eliminate taxonomic problems from consideration when names are added to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," two or more generic names should be placed on that List, in cases where specialists were agreed on the importance of stabilising the nomenclature of a particular group but were not unanimous on the purely taxonomic question of

whether more than one genus was involved and that this decision should be embodied in the regulations governing the preparation of the "Official List."

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to take steps, in compliance with the request addressed to them by the Section on Nomenclature, to concert with specialists to secure the appointment of a committee or committees (a) to study the nomenclature of the Phylum Protozoa and other Phyla containing species which were parasites of Man and (b) to make proposals to the Commission for the addition to the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology," whether under their plenary powers or otherwise, of the names of leading genera of such Phyla, particularly genera containing species which were parasites of Man, for the purpose of promoting the stabilisation of the nomenclature of the groups concerned ;
- (2) to issue a statement drawing the attention of specialists to the action proposed in (1) above.

"Official List

of Generic Names in

Zoology :

**addition to the
regulations
relating to, of a
provision designed
to eliminate
taxonomic
considerations**

6. Arising out of the discussion recorded in Conclusion 5 above, THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to take note that the Section on Nomenclature had decided that there should be added to the regulations governing the preparation of the "Official List of Generic Names in Zoology" a provision that, in order to eliminate taxonomic considerations when names were added to the said "Official List," two or more generic names should be added thereto, in cases where specialists were agreed on the importance of stabilising the nomenclature of a particular group but were not unanimous on the purely taxonomic question of whether more than one genus was involved.

**Ninth and Tenth
Meetings of the
Commission
during its Paris
Session : date and
time appointed**

7. THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) recalled that it had previously been contemplated that it would be necessary for the Commission to hold two further meetings that day, the first in the afternoon and the second in the evening. Such good progress had been made by the Commission in the consideration of their Agenda that it was now possible for him to propose that there should be no meeting that afternoon, thereby making it possible for such members of the Commission who so desired to take part in the excursion to the Château de Versailles which had been arranged by the authorities of the Congress. This change in plan would make it possible

also for him to make progress with the preparation of further documents for the consideration of the Commission. He proposed therefore that the next meeting of the Commission should be held that evening at 2030 hours. As regards the following day there would be a joint meeting with the Section on Nomenclature at 0900 hours.

THE COMMISSION took note of the above arrangements.

(The Commission thereupon adjourned at 1205 hours)

INTERNATIONAL COMMISSION on ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

*Session held during the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology,
Paris, 21st-27th July, 1948*

CONCLUSIONS of the Ninth Meeting held at the Sorbonne in the Amphithéâtre Louis-Liard on Friday, 23rd July, 1948, at 2030 hours

PRESENT :

Mr. Francis Hemming (United Kingdom) (*Acting President*)
 Professor J. Chester Bradley (U.S.A.)
 Professor L. di Capriacco (Italy)
 Mr. N. D. Riley (United Kingdom)
 Professor V. van Straelen (Belgium)
 Professor Robert L. Usinger (U.S.A.)

The following were also present :

Dr. E. A. Chapin (U.S.A.)
 Professor E. Raymond Hall (U.S.A.)
 Dr. Henning Lemche (Denmark)

Mrs. M. F. W. Hemming, *Personal Assistant to the Secretary*
 Miss J. H. Shorey, *Acting Documents Officer*

**Miscellaneous
proposals for the
amendment or
clarification of
the "Règles" :
third instalment**

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
7th Meeting,
Conclusion 6)

1. THE COMMISSION had before them a memorandum by the Secretary (Commission Paper I.C.(48)15), containing a third instalment of miscellaneous proposals received from various sources for the amendment or clarification of the *Règles*. For convenience of reference these proposals, which were 31 in number, had been numbered consecutively with the proposals brought forward in the paper containing the second instalment (Commission Paper I.C.(48)14). The present proposals were therefore numbered (33) to (63).

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

to examine Commission Paper I.C.(48)15, point by point, for the purpose of reaching conclusions regarding the recommendations to be submitted on the questions raised therein.

**Article 27
(proposed insertion
of words making
it clear that this
Article applies,
inter alia, to the
naming of forms
of polymorphic
species)**

2. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Dr. C. A. Hoare (London) (file Z.N.(S.)291), asking for the addition of words to Article 27 to make it clear that the provisions of that Article applied to polymorphic species, together with a note on the same subject set forth in Point (33) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15. It was not clearly stated in Article 27 that its

provisions applied to cases where one form of such a species was named before another in the same way as to different stages in the metamorphosis of a species possessing only a single adult form. Dr. Hoare observed that, while the present wording might be appropriate for the needs of the Metazoa, it did not meet the needs of the Protozoa, where the problem of species possessing both sexual and asexual forms was of special importance.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) observed that Dr. Hoare had drawn attention to what was undoubtedly a technical flaw in Article 27 as that Article at present stood and words should be inserted to make this matter clear. The adoption of an amendment in the sense proposed would not lead to changes in the current nomenclature of the Protozoa, for protozoologists had rightly assumed that the intention, though not the wording, of Article 27 was that its provisions should apply to names given to forms of polymorphic species. This Article had always been so interpreted, for example, in the synonymy of the names given to the human malaria parasites, a subject on which Professor Robert L. Usinger and himself had each made a special study and on which proposals would be laid before the Commission at a later meeting. Though the problem raised by Dr. Hoare was of special importance to protozoologists, it was not a problem confined to the Protozoa, for polymorphism of a very similar kind occurred also in the Class Insecta, where also other forms of polymorphism commonly occurred. It was desirable therefore that the wording to be proposed to meet the point raised by Dr. Hoare should be sufficiently wide to cover all forms of polymorphism in species.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in Article 27 to make it clear that the provisions of that Article applied to names published for forms of polymorphic species and therefore that, in the case of such species, the oldest available specific or subspecific trivial name applied to any form is to be accepted as the trivial name of the species as a whole.

**Article 35
(polymorphism in
trivial names
arising from use of
the same word in
noun and
adjectival form)**

3. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a communication received from Mr. Joshua L. Baily, Jr. (San Diego, California, U.S.A.), on the question whether trivial names which differed from one another only by the form of their termination, for example, in the use of the terminations “-costa” and “-costata” (file Z.N.(S.)309) should be regarded as homonyms of one another, together with a note on the same subject contained in the first part of Point (34) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

In his submission on this matter Mr. Baily had taken the view that, as the spelling differences referred to above were not among the differences specified in paragraph (3) of Article 35, names differing from one another only in this way were not to be rejected as homonyms under the *Règles*. At the same time he brought forward two pairs of names of this kind, where, in his opinion, confusion had already arisen through the great similarity of the trivial names concerned. The cases in question were those presented (1) by the names *Cardita crassicosta* Lamarck, 1819, and *Cardita crassicostata* Sowerby, 1825, and (2) *Cardita laticosta* Eichwald, 1830, and *Cardita laticostata* Sowerby, 1832. In each of these cases, Mr. Baily asked that the Commission should use their plenary powers to suppress the later published of the two names in question. In Commission Paper I.C.(48)15, the Secretary to the Commission took the same view as Mr. Baily regarding the interpretation of the *Règles* in this matter but recommended that Article 35 should be amended to make names belonging to this class homonyms of one another.

In the discussion which ensued the view was expressed that no objection need be taken in principle to the concurrent use in the same genus of trivial names differing from one another solely by reason of the fact that in the one case the word concerned was in noun form and could therefore be treated as being a nominative singular in apposition to the generic name, while in the other case the name was in adjectival form and thus required to agree in gender with the generic name. There should normally be no room for confusion in such cases, having regard to the fact that, under the decisions which had been taken during the present Congress, it would now be made absolutely clear that the list of spelling differences specified in paragraph (3) of Article 35 was an exhaustive list and therefore that no name was to be rejected as a homonym of another name which differed from it in spelling in any other way. On the other hand, it was desirable that trivial names within a given genus should be readily distinguishable from one another. Authors should therefore be recommended to avoid selecting as the trivial name of a new species or subspecies a name which differed only in its termination (noun form or adjectival form, as the case might be) from a trivial name already published for a species in the same genus or allied genera. Naturally, the recognition of names of the kind under discussion as available names, notwithstanding their close similarity, would not preclude the Commission from using their plenary powers to suppress such a name where in an individual case it could be shown that the concurrent

existence of two such closely similar names had already caused, or was likely to cause, confusion.

THE COMMISSION :—

(*Previous reference :
Paris Session,
6th Meeting,
Conclusion 43*)

- (1) agreed that, having regard to the fact that it had now been decided to make it clear that the list of differences in spelling given in paragraph (3) of Article 35 was an exhaustive list, no action required to be taken in regard to trivial names of the same origin and meaning which differed from one another only by reason of the fact that in one case the name was in a noun form, while in the other it was in an adjectival form (e.g. *crassicosta* and *crassicostatus*, -*a*, -*um*), for it would now be clear that, where such names occurred in a single genus, they were not to be regarded as homonyms of one another;
- (2) agreed to recommend that there should be inserted in the *Règles a Recommandation* urging authors not to select a compound word as a new trivial name, where there already existed either in the same genus or in an allied genus a compound trivial name of the same origin and meaning differing therefrom only by reason of the second part of that name consisting of a word in a noun form whereas the corresponding part of the proposed new name consisted of the same word in an adjectival form or *vice versa*. (Example: where in a given genus or group of genera there already exists a trivial name *crassicosta* (noun form), an adjectival trivial name such as *crassicostatus*, -*a*, -*um*, should be avoided, and *vice versa*);
- (3) agreed to recommend that, where in any given case it could be shown that the concurrent existence within a single genus or group of allied genera of trivial names differing from one another only in the manner indicated in (1) above has caused, or was likely to cause, confusion, an end should be put to such confusion or, as the case might be, such confusion should be prevented from arising, by the use of the plenary powers;
- (4) agreed that the Secretary should explain the position in this matter to Mr. Baily and should ask him whether in the circumstances he desired to pursue his application in regard to the two pairs of names in the genus *Cardita* Bruguière, 1792 (Phylum Mollusca) which he had already submitted to the Commission (file Z.N.(S.)309).

**Articles 34 and 35
(third paragraph)
(proposed addition
of a further
category)**

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
6th Meeting,
Conclusions 41 & 43)

**Articles 34 and 35
(words differing
from one another
solely by having as
the accented syllable
the syllable "an"
or "en": proposed
insertion of a
"Recommendation"
urging avoidance)**

**Article 4 :
(situation where the
application of
existing Provisions
leads to the
establishment of
identical family
names in
different groups)**

4. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Captain E. Rivenhall Goffe (King's Somborne, England) asking that certain additions should be made to the list of spelling differences specified in paragraph (3) of Article 35 (file Z.N.(S.)198), together with a proposal in regard thereto submitted in the second part of Point (34) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that the following differences in spelling should be added to the list of such differences to be inserted in the Articles replacing the present Articles 34 and 35 as differences to be ignored in determining whether one name is a homonym of another :—(1) the transcription of the semivowel or consonantal "i" as "y," "ei," "ej" or "ij" or (2) the use of the letters "f" and "ph".

5. Arising out of the discussion on the question dealt with in Conclusion 4 above, THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that a *Recommandation* be added both to Article 34 (generic names) and Article 35 (trivial names) urging authors to avoid selecting as a generic name or a trivial name a word which, in the former case, differs from an existing generic name only by having as its accented syllable the syllable "en" or "an" as the case may be, as in the case of the names *Tarentula* and *Tarantula*, and, in the latter case, differs only in the same respect from an existing trivial name in the same genus or group of allied genera.

6. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the situation which arises when the application of Article 4 in its present form leads to the formation of identical family names for families in different parts of the Animal Kingdom, together with a note on this subject submitted by the Secretary in Point (35) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15. In this connection, the Commission had under consideration also correspondence on this subject which had passed between Commissioner H. Boschma (Netherlands) and the Secretary, consequent upon the former having proposed that means should be found to put an end to the anomaly created by the concurrent existence of the family name CYPRINIDAE in two parts of the Animal Kingdom (namely the Class Pelecypoda and the Class Pisces)(file Z.N.(S.)210).

In the discussion on this question, the view was generally expressed that it was a grave defect in the Articles of the *Règles* relating to the formation of family names that,

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
6th Meeting,
Conclusion 11)

although those Articles contained a provision (admittedly confused and inadequate as it was) regarding the application of the principle of priority to family names, those Articles contained no provision at all for the equally important question of the application of the Law of Homonymy. This was clearly a matter which should be dealt with in the Report on the reform of the provisions in the *Règles* relating to the nomenclature of families which it had been agreed that the Secretary should prepare for consideration at the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress. The existence of duplicate family names in different groups might not be a source of inconvenience to workers who specialised in a narrow field, but it constituted an indefensible anomaly in the classification of the Animal Kingdom as a whole. Pending the complete redrafting of Articles 4 and 5 of the *Règles*, it would be possible to deal with this problem on an *ad hoc* basis; it was desirable that this should be done, for the sooner the more glaring of the present anomalies were removed the better. It should normally be possible to find appropriate solutions on the lines adopted by the Commission in *Opinion* 140 when dealing with the question of the form of the family names to be constructed from the generic names *Merops* Linnaeus, 1758 (Class Aves) and *Merope* Newman, 1838 (Class Insecta).

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that, without prejudice to any decisions that might be taken in the light of the comprehensive Report which the Secretary had been invited to prepare on the question of family names, there should be inserted in the *Règles* a provision that, where the application of Article 4 led to the establishment of two or more families having the same name, the case is to be referred to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, whose duty it shall be to determine the name to be applied to each of the families concerned.

Article 4 (name to be applied to a family where two or more existing families are united on taxonomic grounds) :
postponement of decision pending general inquiry

7. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by the late Dr. A. Steven Corbet (British Museum (Natural History), London) on the question of the procedure to be followed for determining the name of a family when two or more previously established families are united on taxonomic grounds (file Z.N.(S.)265), together with a note on the same subject submitted by the Secretary in Point (36) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15. The particular case raised by Dr. Corbet was concerned with the relative priority to be accorded to the family names RIODINIDAE (formerly ERYCINIDAE) and LIBYTHEIDAE (Class Insecta,

Order LEPIDOPTERA), by an author who regarded these two groups as forming a single family only.

In the discussion on this question, the view was expressed that it was important that provision should be made in the *Règles* as soon as possible for determining the name to be applied to a family in the circumstances described above, for the problem involved was one of the most central of the issues awaiting settlement in the field of family names. It was felt, however, that, inconvenient and unsatisfactory as it was that there should be no rules governing this matter, it would be a mistake to prejudge the issue of the proposed investigation into the problem of the nomenclature of families by making a recommendation to the present Congress on this subject.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

that the question of the provisions to be inserted in the *Règles* in regard to the name to be adopted for a family when two or more existing families were united on taxonomic grounds was one of the problems to which special attention should be paid in the Report on the nomenclature of families and supergeneric groups below family level which at the meeting noted in the margin the Commission had invited the Secretary to prepare for their consideration at their meeting to be held during the next (XIVth) meeting of the Congress.

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
6th Meeting,
Conclusion 11)

**Article 3
(definition of the
expression "Latin"
as there used)**

8. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Professor L. W. Grensted (Oxford University) in regard to the need for the introduction into Article 3 of the *Règles* of words defining the sense in which the word "Latin" is used in that Article (file Z.N.(S.)313), together with a proposal in regard thereto submitted by the Secretary in the first part of Point (37) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that a provision on the following lines be inserted in Article 3 :—

In the interpretation of this Article regard is to be paid to the fact that Latin as used for zoological nomenclature is a living language and therefore that, while classical Latin is necessarily the standard to which zoological names should, so far as possible, conform, that standard is not to be applied in such a way as to ignore later developments of the language or as to override considerations of scientific accuracy, uniformity, intelligibility or practical usefulness.

Article 4
 (proposed removal
 of ambiguities
 regarding the
 method to be
 followed in
 forming a family
 name from a
 given generic
 name)

9. THE COMMISSION had under consideration an application submitted by Professor L. W. Grensted (Oxford University) in regard to the need for removing from Article 4 the ambiguities regarding the procedure to be followed when forming a family name from a given generic name (file Z.N.(S.)313), together with a proposal in regard thereto submitted by the Secretary in the second part of Point (37) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that, in confirmation of the decision taken by the Eighth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Graz in 1910, that the word "stem" should be substituted for the word "root" in the English translation of Article 4 of the *Règles*, the word "thème" should be substituted for the word "radical" in the substantive French text of that Article;
- (2) that a provision to the following effect should be added to Article 4 :—

The expression "stem" is to be interpreted as meaning either (1) the grammatical or classical stem or (2) a part of the stem, the choice to be made in favour of whichever of the foregoing methods both shows most clearly the relationship between the generic name on the one hand and the name of the family on the other and provides the simpler and more euphonious form compatible with that relationship.

Article 14
 (agreement in
 gender with the
 generic name of a
 trivial name,
 when an
 adjectival)

“... et de la
 forme de l’adjectif
 dans les noms
 triviaux.”

10. THE COMMISSION had under consideration (1) a proposal submitted by Mr. W. Parkinson Curtis (United Kingdom) and (2) a proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) on the subject of the agreement in gender with the generic name of trivial names, when adjectival in form (file Z.N.(S.)214), together with a note on the same subject submitted by the Secretary as Point (38) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15. Mr. Parkinson Curtis suggested that the provision that an adjectival trivial name should agree in gender with the generic name should be deleted from Article 14 on the ground that it was obsolete and virtually unworkable. Professor Bonnet's proposals were designed to elucidate certain obscurities in regard to the application of the present provisions, while those submitted by the Secretary were more far-reaching in character, being designed to provide a means for determining the gender of every generic name. In Point (39) of the same Commission Paper (Commission Paper I.C.(48)15) a proposal was submitted that, for the convenience of those zoologists who

were unfamiliar with the Latin language, there should be added to the Second Schedule to the *Règles* a statement of the rules governing the gender of Latin nouns, together with particulars of the better known of those nouns which were exceptions to the normal rules.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that, as the existing provisions of Article 14 regarding the agreement of adjectival trivial names in gender with the generic names with which they were conjoined, as also the supplementary provisions now proposed to be added to those provisions, were mandatory in character, it would not, as he had previously thought, be appropriate to include the proposed statement of the rules governing the gender of Latin nouns in the Schedule which was to replace the present *Appendice* to the *Règles*, for, as already agreed at the meeting noted in the margin, it was now to be made clear in the *Règles* that the provisions of that *Appendice*, and therefore of the Schedule which was to take its place, were non-mandatory in character. If, therefore, the Commission adopted the proposal that the rules governing the gender of Latin nouns when used as generic names should be added to the *Règles*, it would be necessary, in view of the mandatory character of those provisions, to place them in a Schedule distinct from that in which the existing *Appendice* was to be incorporated. The Acting President went on to say that he desired to supplement in one respect the proposal which he had submitted in this matter. It was not only the determination of the gender of Latin nouns which had proved a stumbling-block to those zoologists who had not had a classical education, for the rules governing the declension of Latin adjectives were far from simple and here too it was easy to fall into error. He accordingly proposed that particulars of the rules governing this matter also should be included in the suggested Schedule.

THE COMMISSION agreed:—

- (1) that, having regard to the provisions of Article 3 of the *Règles*, it was essential and inevitable that a trivial name, when an adjective, should agree in gender with the generic name and that the application submitted by Mr. Parkinson Curtis should therefore be rejected;
- (2) that it was essential that the clearest possible directions should be included in the *Règles* regarding the procedure to be followed for determining the gender of generic names;

(Later reference:
Paris Session,
12th Meeting,
Conclusion 25)

(3) in view of (2) above, to recommend :—

(a) that the following provisions should be inserted in the *Règles* for the purpose of determining the gender of nouns used as generic names and consequently for determining the gender in which trivial names, when adjectives, should be cited :—

(i) where a generic name or, in the case of a name consisting of a compound word, the terminal portion of such a name consists either of a classical Latin noun or of a noun, which, though unknown in classical Latin, is found in the later history of the Latin language, the generic name concerned is to be treated as being of the same gender as that of the Latin noun in question, save that, where a Latin noun occurs in more than one gender, the generic name consisting of that noun is to be treated as being of the masculine gender ;

(ii) where a generic name or, in the case of a name consisting of a compound word, the terminal portion of such a name, consists of a Latinised Greek noun either of the classical or non-classical period, the generic name concerned is to be treated as being of the same gender as the Latinised Greek word in question in like manner as in (i) above, Greek nouns for this purpose to retain their original gender, save in any case where a Greek noun became an integral part of the Latin language and, on being so incorporated, was treated as being of a gender different from that which it possessed prior to being so incorporated ;

(iii) where a generic name or, in the case of a name consisting of a compound word, the terminal portion of such a name consists of a word unknown in any stage of the Latin or Greek languages, except in so far as it is

treated as a Latin or Latinised word for the purposes of zoological nomenclature, the following rules are to be followed in determining its gender :—

- (1) if the word so treated as a Latin or Latinised noun has a termination found in the nominative singular of any of the Latin declensions, that word, if having a termination found in the first or fifth declensions, shall be treated as being of the feminine gender, and, if having a termination found in the second, third or fourth declension, shall be treated as being of the gender normally appropriate to a noun having that termination, save that every such word having the termination “-us,” or, as the case may be, the termination “-es” shall be treated in the former case as being of the masculine gender, and in the latter case of the feminine gender ;
- (2) if the word has a termination not found in the nominative singular of any of the five Latin declensions, that word is to be treated as being of the masculine gender.
- (b) that, in order to facilitate the determination of the gender of any given generic name and the correct formation of adjectival trivial names :—
 - (i) there should be added to the *Règles* a Schedule, to be inserted at an appropriate point among the other Schedules, containing a concise statement of the rules governing :—
 - (1) the gender of Latin nouns and of Greek nouns, when latinised, together with particulars of the better known of such nouns, the gender of which differed from that normally appropriate for a noun belonging to the declension concerned and having the termination in question :

- (2) the formation of the respective genders of Latin adjectives and of Greek adjectives, when latinised, together with particulars relating to the better known of such adjectives, the genders of which were not formed in accordance with the normal rules;
- (ii) there should be inserted in relation to sub-paragraph (a) of the first paragraph of Article 14 words prescribing that the gender of generic names is to be determined in accordance with the rules specified in (a) above as supplemented by the Schedule specified in (b) (i) above, and the gender of adjectives is to be formed in accordance with the rules specified in the said Schedule.

**Article 25,
Proviso (c),
(point of time as
from which
effective)**

11. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal (file Z.N.(S.)352) for the clarification of the point of time decided upon by the Tenth International Congress of Zoology at its meeting held at Budapest in 1927 as the point of time as from which the proviso (c) then added to Article 25 was to come into operation, submitted by the Secretary in Point (40) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that the provisions of Proviso (c) to Article 25 came into operation as from midnight G.M.T. (Greenwich Mean Time) 31st December, 1930/1st January, 1931.

**"Appendice" to the
"Règles"
(proposed
correction of an
error in section
"G")**

12. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Commissioner H. Boschma (Netherlands) for the correction of a minor error in Section "G" of the *Appendice* to the *Règles* (file Z.N.(G.)10), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in Point (41) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

(*Previous reference:
Paris Session,
4th Meeting,
Conclusion 3*)

(1) to take note that the statement contained in the sentence "the soft aspirate may be used to represent the Arabic *ain*," which appeared at the end of the sixteenth of the recommendations enumerated in Section G of the *Appendice* to the *Règles*, shortly to be converted into a Schedule, was incorrect;

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
7th Meeting,
Conclusion 22)

**Article 14
(status of a
trivial name
consisting of an
unchanged surname
of a modern
personage treated
as a Latin or
Latinised word)**

(2) to recommend that the error referred to in (1) above should be corrected when the wording of the recommendations set forth in Section G of the *Appendice* were revised as agreed upon at the meeting noted in the margin.

13. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by the late Professor T. D. A. Cockerell (U.S.A.) (file Z.N.(S.)165) that a ruling should be given on the question whether a trivial name consisting of an unchanged surname of a modern personage but treated as a Latin or Latinised word should be corrected to comply with the requirements of Article 14 (see Cockerell, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 89), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in Point (42) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE ACTING PRESIDENT (MR. FRANCIS HEMMING) said that until fairly recently almost the only cases of the kind referred to in Professor Cockerell's application were those found in the works of French authors of the early decades of the XIXth century. Within recent years there had, however, been a recrudescence of this type of trivial name, as the result—as it appeared from correspondence—of a misreading of the first paragraph of Article 14 which provided that a trivial name might be a noun in the nominative singular in apposition to the generic name. Trivial names consisting of unlatinised modern patronymics must however be regarded as defective, for such a method of forming a trivial name based on a modern patronymic was inconsistent with the intention, if not with the actual provisions, of the third paragraph of Article 14. Moreover, even where such names were printed in italics it was difficult to sustain an argument that a name, so formed, had been “latinisé.” within the meaning of Article 3 of the *Règles*. Whatever decision the Commission might take on the question raised by Professor Cockerell, it was desirable that the provisions in Article 14 relating to the formation of trivial names based upon the surnames of modern personages should be co-ordinated with the general provisions relating to the formation of trivial names specified in the first paragraph of that Article.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

(1) that words should be inserted in the *Règles* to make it clear that, where a trivial name is published in the form of an unchanged surname of a modern personage (e.g. where, to honour the Frenchman Cerisy, Godart published in 1824 a

trivial name *cerisy* in the binominal combination *Papilio cerisy*) and (as in the example cited above) the author treated the name, so formed, as a Latin or Latinised word, the form of the trivial name so published is to be corrected so as to comply with the requirements of the paragraph of Article 14 which deals with the formation of trivial names based on modern patronymics (the name *cerisy* in the example quoted above thus being corrected to *cerisyi*), the name so corrected to retain priority as from the date on which it was published in the incorrect form (i.e. in the above case from 1824, the date when the name was published in the incorrect form *cerisy*) and to continue to be attributed to the author by whom it was so published ;

- (2) that Article 14 should be amended in such a way as to make it clear that the provision in the first paragraph of that Article that a trivial name may be a noun in the nominative singular in apposition to the generic name does not apply to trivial names based on the surnames of modern personages.

Article 14 (status of a trivial name consisting of a phonetic reproduction of the initials of one or more persons)

14. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Mr. R. G. Fennah (St. Lucia, B.W.I.) (file Z.N.(S.)163) that a ruling should be given on the question whether a trivial name based upon the phonetic reproduction of the initials of a zoologist or zoologists complied with the requirements of the *Règles* (see Fennah, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.* 1 : 89), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in the first part of Point (43) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed :—

- (1) to recommend that words should be inserted in Article 14 to make it clear that a trivial name (like a generic name) may consist of an arbitrary combination of letters, a trivial name so formed to be treated as an indeclinable noun in the nominative singular ;
- (2) that, on the adoption of the recommendation submitted in (1) above, a trivial name consisting of a phonetic reproduction of the initials of one or more persons would, if treated as a Latin word, comply with the requirements of Article 14.

Article 8
 (conversion of
 "Recommanda-
 tions" into
 mandatory
 provisions)

(Later reference :
Paris Session,
9th Meeting,
Conclusion 37)

Articles 8 & 14
 (proposed
 "Recommenda-
 tion" condemning
 names suggesting
 a bizarre or
 other objectionable
 meaning in some
 language other
 than Latin)

(Previous reference:
Paris Session,
7th Meeting,
Conclusion 12)

15. In the course of the discussion on the proposal dealt with in Conclusion 14 above, attention was drawn to the fact that in its present form Article 8 was defective, since the second and third of the three provisions concerned (of which the third was exactly parallel to the provision which it had now been agreed to be added to Article 14) appeared not as mandatory provisions but, quite inappropriately, as *Recommandations*.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

that on the forthcoming revision of the text of the *Règles*, the two provisions which at present appeared as *Recommandations* annexed to Article 8 be converted into mandatory provisions, subject as regards the second, to names falling within the scope of subparagraph (h) being excluded from the scope of subparagraph (k).

16. THE COMMISSION had under consideration a proposal submitted by Professor Pierre Bonnet (France) that a provision should be inserted in the *Règles* invalidating names which, while purporting to be Latinised words, were combinations of syllables conveying in some language other than Latin a meaning that was bizarre or otherwise improper (file Z.N.(S.)352), together with a note thereon submitted by the Secretary in the second part of Point (43) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

In submitting this proposal Professor Bonnet had drawn attention to the generic names *Ochisme* and *Marichisme* published in 1904 by the British zoologist Kirkaldy, names which might appear innocuous to any non-English speaking zoologist but which to any person acquainted with the English language were obviously unsuitable and improper being no more than the English expressions "O, kiss me" and "Mary, kiss me" written together as though the three words were one. Such names were on a par with names like *Vienferdodoleon* or *Prentoncafelea* if coined by an irresponsible Frenchman. Names of this kind were open to strong objection and their publication should be prohibited.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that there should be added to Article 8 a *Recommandation* condemning the selection as a generic name of a word which purported to be an arbitrary combination of letters but which, when pronounced, appeared to be a word or words in some language other than Latin, especially where those words had a bizarre, comic or otherwise objectionable meaning, and urging authors to refrain from publishing such names;

**Article 23
(proposed
clarification in
certain respects)**

(2) that a *Recommandation* in terms similar to those specified in (1) above but relating to trivial names should be inserted in Article 14.

17. THE COMMISSION had under consideration the following papers relating to the use of parentheses (round brackets) in cases where subgeneric names are cited in addition to generic names or the status of a trivial name is altered in a given genus.

- (a) a request received from Dr. C. F. W. Muesebeck (U.S.A.) for a ruling on the interpretation of Article 23 in cases where a species is originally described as being both in a genus and in a subgenus and later the subgenus is elevated to generic rank and the species is transferred to the genus so erected (file Z.N.(S.) 128) (see Muesebeck, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 92);
- (b) a request received from Professor R. Chester Hughes (U.S.A.) for a ruling on the interpretation of Article 23 in relation to the use of parentheses (round brackets) when citing the name of an author of a subspecific trivial name when that name appears in conjunction with the same generic name but not in the same relationship thereto as when originally published (file Z.N.(S.) 129) (see Hughes, 1945, *Bull. zool. Nomencl.*, **1** : 91-92);
- (c) a note on the above cases submitted by the Secretary in Point (44) in Commission Paper I.C.(48)15.

THE COMMISSION agreed to recommend :—

- (1) that Article 23 should be redrafted, so far as necessary, to make it clear that the provisions of that Article apply only to the case of a species or subspecies which is originally described as belonging to one nominal genus but later is transferred to another nominal genus, and therefore that it is irrelevant for the purposes of Article 23 whether a species or subspecies, when first described, in addition to being placed in a genus was placed also in a subgenus, as also is the question whether a species or subspecies originally published in a genus without a subgenus being cited is later cited under both a generic and a subgeneric name and *vice versa* ;
- (2) that the name of an author is not to be placed in brackets (parentheses) when a trivial name originally published as the name of a species is

THANKS TO U.N.E.S.C.O.

The International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, on behalf of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, have great pleasure in expressing their grateful thanks to the UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANISATION (U.N.E.S.C.O.) for the financial assistance afforded towards the cost of producing the present volume.

BULLETIN OF ZOOLOGICAL NOMENCLATURE

Notice to subscribers regarding the arrangements made for the completion of volume 1 and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5

The following arrangements have been made for completing volume 1 of the *Bulletin of Zoological Nomenclature* and for the publication of volumes 2, 3, 4 and 5 :—

Volume 1 : A concluding Part (Part 12), containing, *inter alia*, the Title Page, Table of Contents, and alphabetical subject index, will be published shortly.

Volume 2 : This volume, like Volume 1, will be devoted to the publication of applications in regard to nomenclatorial problems submitted by specialists to the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature for decision. Publication will commence at an early date.

Volume 3 : This volume, which is now complete in 9 Parts, is devoted to the publication of the memoranda, reports and other documents considered by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and by the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology at their meetings held in Paris in July 1948.

Volume 4 : This volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature at its Session held in Paris in July 1948*. Parts 1-9 have already been published and the remaining Parts are in the press.

Volume 5 : At the request of the Bureau of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, this volume will be devoted to the publication of the *Official Record of Proceedings of the Section on Nomenclature of the Thirteenth International Congress of Zoology, Paris, July 1948*, together with the Reports submitted to the Congress by the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature and the Section on Nomenclature.

INQUIRIES

All inquiries regarding publications should be addressed to the International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature, and all inquiries regarding the scientific work of the Commission to the Secretary to the Commission at the following addresses :—

International Trust for Zoological Nomenclature : 41, Queen's Gate, London, S.W.7, England.

International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature : Secretariat of the Commission, 28 Park Village East, Regent's Park, London, N.W.1, England.